DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 100 EA 022 830

AUTHOR Paule, Lynde
TITLE Oregon School Improvement and Professional Development Project. Final Report, Year 2.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, OR. Assessment and Evaluation Program.
SPONS AGENCY Oregon State Dept. of Education, Salem.
PUB DATE Aug 90
NOTE 75p.; For a related document, see EA 022 829.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Collegiality; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Institutional Mission; Organizational Objectives; *Outcomes of Education; Participative Decision Making; *Professional Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

Second-year outcomes of the Oregon School Improvement and Professional Development Project, which included 54 new and 32 continuing program sites, are presented in this report. Interviews with 187 staff members from 24 sites generated information on program impacts on goal development, assessment activities, school-based management, and professional development. Findings indicate an increase in goal-setting activities and successes attributable to well-designed school missions. Assessment activities became more focused on accountability and elicited increased faculty involvement. The role of the principal was crucial in implementing school-based management, which resulted in improved teacher-administrator relationships and greater teacher autonomy. Faculty acquired greater influence on professional development, and those activities related to academic excellence had the greatest schoolwide impact. Four tables are included. (6 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED330100

Oregon School Improvement and Professional Development Project

Final Report Year 2

Submitted to the
Oregon Department of Education

Prepared by

Lynde Paule, Ph. D.

Evaluation and Assessment Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

August 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. J. Case

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 022 830

Table of Contents

List of Tables ii

Acknowledgements iii

1. Introduction 1

2. Summary and Discussion of Findings 3

3. Program Description 8

4. Source of Data 10

5. Results & Discussion: Impact on Schools 15

Development of School Improvement Goals 15
Assessment of Educational Progress 23
School-Based Management 31
Professional Growth and Development 49

References 57

List of Tables

1. Type of School Receiving Site Visits 11

2. Distribution of Interviewees By Type of Site 12

3. SIPD Project Focus By School Level 13

4. Teacher Influence and Involvement in Decision Making 47

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank NWREL colleagues Kathleen Cotton, for her assistance in interviewing SIPD project participants and for reviewing and adding her golden touch to the final draft of this report, and Connie Slettum, for her assistance in preparing the report.

I also wish to thank Joyce Reinke and Michael Dalton of the Oregon Department of Education for their input during various stages of the project.

Finally, I want to thank the 187 faculty and community members of the funded and nonfunded projects for giving their valuable time to talk about their project. I am grateful for the education they provided during discussions about how schools work.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background and Overview of HB 2020

The School Improvement and Professional Development Program (SIPD) had its origins in 1987 in the recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Oregon Legislature's Joint Committee on Education. That advisory committee, through its recommendations, hoped to address two major concerns: *"... the lack of professional growth opportunities within the careers of individual teachers and workplace conditions that compromise the professional autonomy and effectiveness of all teachers."*

As a result of the advisory committee's recommendations, the Oregon legislature enacted HB 2020 which directed the State Board of Education to establish a School Improvement and Professional Development Program (SIPD) to encourage initiatives which promote educational excellence in Oregon's public schools. Specifically SIPD is based on the following rationale taken from HB 2020:

1. Further initiatives to promote educational excellence in the public schools are of vital importance in increasing student learning and strengthening Oregon's economy.

2. The state should encourage and assist local school districts in their efforts to establish school goals through a process that involves educators and members of the community and to develop effective tools to measure progress against those goals that will increase the public accountability of educational programs.

3. New career opportunities for professional development are desirable to recognize skills, knowledge of their subject matter and other appropriate indicators of their professional growth.

4. The establishment of site committees for the school district and for individual schools is desirable to encourage new initiatives in school improvement and shared decision making, the assessment of educational progress, and provide new and expanded opportunities for teachers and to facilitate efforts to restructure the school workplace to provide educators with greater responsibility while increasing their accountability.

During the 1989-90 school year, 86 Oregon schools received funding for School Improvement and Professional Development projects. Interviews with school personnel in 24 schools were conducted to address the basic evaluation question:

What differences did the School Improvement and Professional Development Program make with respect to:

- o the development of school improvement goals,
- o the assessment of educational progress,
- o school-based management of improvement, and
- o opportunities for teachers' professional growth?

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) conducted the qualitative evaluation of the School Improvement and Professional Development Program under a contract with the Oregon Department of Education. Data were collected during the winter of 1990 from interviews with staff from a sample of 24 projects.

In the following sections of this report, the findings from the data analysis are reported in relation to the four parts of the evaluation question stated above. Prior to the presentation of these results, however, is a description of the key characteristics of the programs.

2. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section contains the major findings from year two of the Oregon School Improvement and Professional Development (SIPD) Project. Data for this evaluation were collected from interviews with staff from a sample of 24 new, continuation, and nonfunded projects. Site visits were made to elementary, middle/junior high and high schools from January through March 1990. Using a structured but open response format, interviewees were asked to discuss the implementation of their school's SIPD project and the impact of being awarded (or not awarded) an SIPD grant on goal development, on assessment activities, on school-based management and on professional development activities in their schools. Data were analyzed by type of project (new, continuation, nonfunded), school level, district size, and position/membership on the site committee. The major findings from year two are highlighted in the sections that follow.

Impact on Goal Development

- As a result of SIPD, there was a substantial increase in the amount and types of activities related to goal setting. There was more teacher and community involvement in developing school goals. Faculty and community members met together and were responsible for discussing problem areas, gathering and assembling relevant data, and selecting school goals. Schools applying for continuation grants approached the needs identification task from the perspective of first assessing whether progress had been made towards reaching the goals they had set for themselves during year one.

- The extent to which a school had a carefully articulated central school mission made a difference in its ability to assemble relevant data to develop or refine goals that could serve as organizational means to an organizational end.

- Developing an overall school mission around which faculty could collaborate and plan their activities and around which individual and schoolwide efforts could be marshalled was easier to arrange and achieve in smaller schools, particularly elementary schools and in schools with continuation grants. Developing a unity of purpose was simpler in schools where faculty shared similar beliefs and values and in schools where faculty already had experience in a schoolwide goal-setting process.

Impact on Assessment Activities

- As a result of SIPD, there are more assessment activities, a stronger commitment to accountability, and greater involvement of faculty in assessment activities. However, the area of assessment has posed more problems for schools, especially schools with new projects, than any other feature of HB 2020. The greatest difficulty was in relating assessment activities undertaken in a school to measuring goal attainment.

- The nature and extent of respondents' knowledge about and involvement in implementing assessment and evaluation practices in SIPD schools varied according to their proximity to the project, the clarity and concreteness of the project, and to their past experience in project development and implementation. Individuals closer to the design and implementation of their project generally had a better grasp of the role of assessment and evaluation and the data being gathered. Site committee members in schools with continuation projects were appreciably better informed about and more comfortable with assessment activities and their relationship to the evaluation of project goal attainment than site committee members in schools with new projects. This was also true for non-site committee members; non-site committee members in most of the continuation projects could talk about assessment practices whereas non-site committee members in new projects had only the vaguest understanding of assessment and evaluation activities. Level of awareness and implementation of assessment activities in nonfunded schools were contingent on the degree to which a project was actually being implemented.

- Faculty in schools with a continuation project attributed their increased knowledge and comfort level with assessment and evaluation activities to several factors that were related to both their actual project and themselves. For most sites year two was "the implementation year," i.e., a concrete project was being put into place. Thus, goals were tied to program implementation making it easier to identify indicators of change and to focus attention on evaluation. The fact that people had a year of experience also made them more comfortable and confident of their ability to gather data and to know how to use the information collected.

- More attention needs to be paid to helping schools design concrete goals and assessment activities in tandem--not in isolation from one another--and that are related to a school improvement project that represents an integrated whole. At the time goals are developed, assessment activities should be developed that will be used to measure progress toward goal attainment and to determine if goals have been reached. The link between the two cannot be oblique.

Impact on School-Based Management

- School leadership was viewed as critical to schools' ability to reach the goals they had set for themselves. The school principal was widely regarded as the key to school improvement, especially principals who, in the eyes of their staff, were strong educational leaders. These principals had a clear vision of where they wanted to take their school and the clear knowledge of how to get there.

- In both schools with new projects and those with continuation projects, principals exhibited an array of leadership qualities--knowledge of school problems, openness with staff, clarity of strength and purpose, and a willingness to innovate. They were able to articulate clear goals, exercise strong instructional leadership, and held high expectations and respect for students and teachers. SIPD principals were able to deal effectively with the demands and pressures from parents, with heavy administrative burdens, and with exigencies posed by the community. Principals took pride in their schools and were inclined to grant teachers autonomy in their own spheres of expertise, to encourage their participation in decision making about important matters of school policy, and to promote a context of interaction, exchange of ideas, and mutual respect. However, principals' ability to keep a school focused on its mission, to work effectively with parents and community, to motivate teachers, to marshall resources, and the like was related to the mix of people in the school and the conditions outside the school. The greater autonomy a principal felt the school had, the more likely a principal was able to create a professional environment for teachers.

- A school's autonomy was related to the degree of social homogeneity within the community and the absence of serious problems that a school could not handle by itself. When a school was located in a community where there were no serious conflicts of interest about important educational issues and no serious problems the school could not handle, a school was more autonomous and, in turn, teachers were more autonomous.

- Staff members at SIPD schools saw the project site committees as the catalysts for change, the individuals with a clear vision of how to orchestrate change and improve their school, and the group responsible for keeping the project alive. However, the responsibilities of site committees varied from year one to year two of a project. During year one, management responsibilities included making project-related decisions, directing project activities, keeping lines of communication open, disseminating information, overseeing professional development activities, collecting and analyzing data, preparing reports, administering funds, and developing and administering mini-grant programs. During projects' second year, site committees had the same responsibilities and were also responsible for overseeing the implementation of a school's SIPD project. This required managing people involved in a change process. Because enforcing the implementation of an SIPD project was perceived as outside the jurisdiction of site committees, site committee members expressed frustration and discomfort with this new role and responsibility. This issue will require resolution by faculty members as schools move from a traditional division of labor to a site-based management system.

- For both new and continuation projects the collaborative relationships among teachers that were formed at the initial stages of project development have endured and have resulted in the formation of a community of professionals (or in multiple professional communities) where educational values are shared. Schoolwide decisions are now often reached by discussion and consensus. Principals are now encouraging teachers to participate in collaborative planning and policy making outside the classroom. However, the nature and extent of teacher collaboration is different for elementary, intermediate, and high schools because of differences in norms, values, beliefs, and practices at the different school levels.

- As a result of the implementation of HB 2020, decision-making opportunities at the school level have increased. However, decision opportunities are not the same for all schools or for all people in schools. Organizational size, school level, staff position, membership on a school's site committee, whether a school is implementing a new or a continuation project, and characteristics of the school's institutional environment mitigate decision opportunities for faculty members. Opportunities for teachers to influence decisions with nonfunded projects are related to the same mix of variables as are found in schools with funded projects with two additionally essential ingredients: the principal and the site committee. Strong school and project leadership are critical for making decision opportunities available to faculty in schools with nonfunded projects.

- Prior to HB 2020, school improvement decisions had been predominantly the jurisdiction of school and district administrators and are now the province of both teachers and school administrators. Resource acquisition and being able to manage the resources were key factors in this shift of control. In many schools with continuation projects, especially large comprehensive high schools involved in structural reform efforts, the shift toward even greater teacher control is evident. Schoolwide, teacher-instigated programmatic changes in elementary and middle/junior high schools are also occurring.

- A majority of faculty in all types of projects and across all grade levels felt they are most involved and influential in decisions around curriculum and instruction and least involved and influential in decisions pertaining to school budget and policy making. However, teachers in high schools with continuation projects and in middle/junior high schools with new projects feel they have gained greater influence and involvement in these kinds of decisions since the beginning of their SIPD project. Teachers also feel they have made progress in decisions relating to school improvement and have increased the number and kinds of decisions they make pertaining to curriculum and instruction. Teachers wish to have greater influence over policies that affect their work lives. The constraints of school and district administration surfaced most often in discussions about areas where teachers felt the least influential and involved.

Impact on Professional Growth and Development

- Professional development activities were an integral part of every SIPD project; however, in schools with new projects, professional development activities played a prominent role in the developmental stages of a school's SIPD project, and in schools with continuation projects where attention was focused on the implementation of the project, professional development activities played more of a secondary role. In schools with nonfunded projects, the opportunity to participate in professional development activities was contingent on the availability of district resources.

- Control over professional development decisions rested with site committees and often with the entire faculty at a school. Teachers felt that being able to decide how to enhance one's role as an educator was an important source of power and control over one's work.

- The availability of professional development activities at a time when most districts have had to curtail staff development efforts was reported as a significant feature of HB 2020.

- Professional developed activities that provided new information and knowledge about teaching strategies, a new language for teachers to communicate with one another, and that encouraged teacher interaction and dialogue about the newly acquired learning were perceived as the most helpful and the most utilized.

- Professional development activities that were integrally related to a cogently designed and well-articulated school improvement program had the greatest impact schoolwide, especially professional development activities that were tied to goals that promoted academic excellence.

- Professional development activities have resulted in teachers acquiring expertise and skills as trainers. Teachers in several schools are training teachers in their school and have been hired to provide training to teachers in other schools.

- Professional development activities at the intermediate and high school levels were more successful if they had a ready application to the subject matter of individual teachers.

- Although mini-grant projects had to relate to the school's SIPD project goals, they allowed individuals to design a project tailored to their specific needs and interests. For many individuals, this was the most satisfying aspect of the SIPD project.

3. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Site Selection

House Bill 2020 provided for a competitive application procedure for SIPD grants. Similar to last year's demographic selection criteria four district size categories were created: small (under 1000 ADM), medium (1000 - 3999 ADM), large (4000 - 10,000 ADM), and very large (over 10,000 ADM); three grade level categories were delineated: elementary, middle/junior high school, senior high school; and new this year, two classifications for distinguishing between new program applicants and continuation program applicants were designated. Applications from schools of a similar classification, district size, and grade level were grouped and reviewed together.

The same procedure employed to allocate funds to SIPD sites for the 1988-89 school year was used to select both new and continuation sites for the 1989-90 school year. Based upon a $1000 FTE formula in the legislation, funds were provided for approximately 9.4 percent of Oregon's teachers. The total amount of money available in each of the size categories was determined by multiplying the number of FTE in each category by 9.4 percent times $1000. Approximately 2.4 million dollars were awarded to 86 schools in the 1989-90 school year. This allocation was distributed between new and continuation schools. Both new and continuation sites could elect to implement their grant (i.e., allocate their funds) over a one or two-year period.

Grant applications were screened initially by a group of educators selected by the Oregon Department of Education who rated the applications on program criteria established by the legislation. Their ratings were then reviewed by a 2020 advisory committee appointed by the state superintendent. The committee's final recommendations were sent to the state board of education. This year there were a total of 178 applications and grants were awarded to 54 new program sites and 32 continuation program sites. Within the new site category, 35 were elementary, 12 were middle or junior high, and 7 were senior high schools. Within the continuation site category, 18 were elementary, 6 were middle or junior high, and 8 were senior high schools. Implementation of SIPD projects was facilitated through technical assistance provided by the Oregon Department of Education and three Professional Development Centers located across the state.

Research on School Improvement

Space does not permit a full discussion of the research on school improvement. Good overviews of the research are documented elsewhere, such as *Effective Schooling Practices: A Research Synthesis-1990 Update* (Cotton, 1990), *Effective Schools: A Review* (Purkey and Smith, 1983), and *Reaching for Excellence: An Effective Schools Sourcebook* (Kyle, 1985). The findings from all of the studies reviewed--known collectively as "effective schools research"--are consistent enough to yield a reasonably clear view of the organizational foundations of effective school performance: clear school goals, rigorous academic standards, order and discipline, graded homework, strong leadership by the principal, teacher participation in decision making, parental support and cooperation, and high expectations for student performance. The research findings also have emphasized that the internal components of a school are inevitably interdependent to a great degree. For example, the leadership of principals is contingent on the quality of teachers,

and the behavior of teachers is contingent on the behavior of principals. The rigor of school goals depends on the strength of principals, who must articulate them, and on the competence of teachers, who must implement them. Every element of school organization is bound up with every other element. Hence, school effectiveness depends on viewing the school "as a total entity" (Goodlad, 1984). Most successful school improvement efforts and reform movements subscribe to this organizational perspective.

Oregon's School Improvement and Professional Development Program (SIPD) is no exception. Findings from year one of the Oregon SIPD indicated that in the "2020 schools" there was strong leadership, clear school goals had been developed by staff, teachers were involved in a variety of school and professional decisions, there was active parent and community interest in schools, and there was mutual respect and regard among students, teachers, and administrators (Paule, Faddis, and Savard, 1989). Importantly, these attributes of 2020 schools were found to be intricately linked to one another, that is, there was no single dimension that operated independently of the others; rather, the organizational effectiveness of 2020 schools was a syndrome of related influences and effects that appeared to operate in a reciprocal fashion.

The possibility for continued success of SIPD clearly exists. An important study by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) (Anderson and Odden, 1986) suggests that state initiatives can have a strong local impact if:

1. There is general state pressure to improve.
2. There is political support from leaders in both the executive and legislative branches.
3. Discretionary money is available to local districts and schools.
4. There is political support and appropriate organizational structure within the state department of education.
5. The state department has a collegial relationship with local districts and schools.
6. There are adequate resources.
7. There is a state effort to develop local capacity through technical assistance.

Each of these factors has been and continues to be, at least to some extent, a feature of SIPD.

4. SOURCE OF DATA

Data for this evaluation were collected from interviews with staff from a sample of 24 new, continuation, and nonfunded projects. Site visits were made to schools from January through March, 1990. The sample was selected to achieve a balance of elementary, middle/junior high, and secondary schools across the four district sizes. All program continuation grant recipient schools that had been visited during year one of SIPD were revisited and four schools that were visited last year that did not receive continuation funding were revisited. The remaining six schools visited were newly funded. The decision to visit continuation sites was predicated on acquiring an understanding of the process of change in SIPD schools--in particular, those features of school organization that either facilitated or constrained staff from achieving the goals they had set for themselves. Since acquiring resources was cited by interviewees last year as a key factor in being able to work on their school improvement projects, a decision was also made to visit schools that did not receive continuation funding to learn about the effects of not receiving a grant on the continuation of project activities. Table 1 shows the distribution of schools by classification, grade level, and district size.

The purpose of the interviews was to give faculty members an opportunity, using a structured but open response format, to discuss the implementation of their school's SIPD project. Interviews were conducted with randomly selected members of the site committee, with individuals not on the site committee, with recipients of mini-grants, with the site committee chair, and with the school principal. A total of 187 interviews were conducted. Each interview lasted from 30 minutes to one hour. Table 2 shows the distribution of interviewees by type of site.

Overview of Funded Projects

While each of the 24 SIPD projects visited is unique, there are certain similarities in their major goals, and most sites had multiple goals. Table 3 displays this relationship.

As Table 3 shows, when all types of school projects (new, continuation, nonfunded) are combined, project foci are similar across grade levels. With the exception of projects including a focus on student concerns and on assessment, differences that exist are slight. Elementary and middle/junior high schools tend to concentrate their attention on instructional/curriculum goals, on school/community partnerships, and on governance goals; and high schools focus theirs more on student concerns, professional development activities, and school governance goals. The small number of new projects and nonfunded projects relative to the number of continuation projects precludes a comparative analysis by type of project. However, the issue of differences in project focus will be addressed in later sections of this report.

Examples of goals with an assessment focus include:

_____ To assess students' writing in a systematic manner.

_____ To evaluate student progress in reasoning ability.

_____ To evaluate writing through trait analysis.

Table 1

Type of Schools Receiving Site Visits

DISTRICT SIZE	SCHOOL LEVEL		
	Elementary	Middle/Junior High	Senior High
Small (Under 1000 ADM)	2 continuation	1 new 1 nonfunded	1 continuation 1 new
Medium (1000-3999 ADM)	2 continuation	1 new 1 continuation	1 nonfunded 1 continuation
Large (4000-10,000 ADM)	1 continuation 1 nonfunded	2 continuation	2 continuation
Very Large (over 10,000 ADM)	1 new 1 nonfunded	2 new	2 continuation

Examples of goals with an instructional/curriculum focus include:

_____ To implement cooperative learning techniques schoolwide.

_____ To implement programs in the writing process and in art production, appreciation and critique.

_____ To develop a coordinated system of instruction.

Examples of goals with a student focus are:

_____ To create a school program specific to the needs of middle school age children.

_____ To increase student achievement in reading and language usage through the implementation of communication connections.

_____ To enable students to identify the most appropriate personal, academic, and career choices.

Table 2

Distribution of Interviewees By Type of Site

		PRINCIPAL	SITE CHAIR	SITE MEMBER	NON-SITE MEMBER	MINI GRANT
Continuation	Elementary	5	6**	5	11	6
	Middle	3	3	4	6	5
	High School	6	6	18	25	16
New	Elementary	1	1	3	2	0
	Middle	4*	3	8	9	3
	High School	1	1	0	2	2
Nonfunded	Elementary	2	1	3	4	NA
	Middle	1	1	1	2	NA
	High School	1	1	2	3	NA

* Principal also served as chair of site committee

** Two individuals served as co-chairs of site committee

Examples of goals with a school/community focus include:

_____ To improve the partnership between staff, students, and parents by increasing communication.

_____ To establish procedures to guide parent and community involvement in the schoolwide focus on improving student performance in writing.

Examples of goals with a professional development focus are:

_____ To receive training for teachers to expand their knowledge of educational theories or practices related to writing curriculum.

_____ To receive training for teachers in self-esteem to help students better meet their needs in a changing society.

Examples of goals with a governance focus include:

_____ To improve collegial and participatory management skills with a focus on communication, group problem-solving and group decision-making.

_____ To increase teacher participation in school decision-making through formation of a site committee/management team.

Table 3

SIPD Project Focus By School Level

SCHOOL LEVEL		TYPE OF GOALS					
		Assessment Focus	Instructional/ Curriculum Focus	Student Focus	School/ Community Focus	Professional Development Focus	Governance Focus
NEW PROJECTS	Elementary (1)*		1		1	1	1
	Middle/ Junior H.S. (4)		2	2	3	1	
	Senior H.S. (1)		2	1		1	1
CONT. PROJECTS	Elementary (5)	2	4	1	5	2	4
	Middle/ Junior H.S. (3)	1	1	1	1		3
	Senior (6)		1	5	3	5	6
NON-FUNDED PROJECTS	Elementary (2)	1	2			1	1
	Middle/ Junior H.S. (1)					1	1
	Senior (1)			1			
TOTAL	Elementary (8)	3	7	1	6	4	6
	Middle/ Junior H.S. (8)	1	3	3	4	2	4
	Senior (8)	0	3	7	3	6	7

* Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of sites at that level.

In summary, most projects had from two to four goals. This was true for both new and continuation projects; nonfunded sites had between one and four goals, depending on how active the staff was in pursuing its original project. Often goals were related to a school improvement theme. Some schools tended to concentrate their attention in one particular area, e.g., writing, and develop an intellectually coherent school improvement program that could be realized through the attainment of several related goals. For instance, an elementary school with a continuation project focused its attention on the improvement of student performance in writing through four related goals in the areas of instruction/curriculum, assessment, teacher training in writing and assessment techniques, and parent/community involvement in improving student performance in writing. Other schools designed projects which cut across several areas that were related at a more general level, e.g., improving students' self-esteem. In some instances, goals were not related in the sense that they seemingly were not connected to an overarching school philosophy or mission, or they were dependent on staff development training that was to occur too late in the school year to make a difference, or they were dependent on student achievement measures that were not aligned with an instructional/curriculum goal. All of these types of differences in project focus seemed to vary more by grade level than by type of project (e.g., new, continuation, nonfunded) and will be addressed in the sections that follow.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

In this section, the impact of the SIPD program on the development of school improvement goals, the assessment of educational progress, school-based management of improvement and opportunities for teachers' professional growth are discussed.

Development of School Improvement Goals

Overview

A flurry of organized activity led by a small group of enthusiastic faculty members best captures the development of school improvement goals in each of the SIPD schools. For all types of projects, the goal development process began during the winter months prior to submitting a grant application and for all types of projects the way in which information was gathered and collated set the stage for how faculty members would work together after the grant had been awarded. For new projects, initial interest in applying for a grant began with a small group of interested faculty members who gathered to discuss the grant and the application process. Most often a central office administrator had apprised the school principal about the grant, and the principal then met with interested faculty to talk over the scope of work involved in applying for a grant. In the schools visited, the group involved in the early stages of grant development were elected by their colleagues as the school's 2020 site committee. In schools already involved in implementing projects, interest in applying for a continuation grant came, most often, directly from site committee members themselves. Indeed, by the end of the first year of implementing a 2020 project, the groundswell of enthusiasm and support came from within the school and the motivation and interest in reapplying for a 2020 grant from the group most closely associated with the intricacies of the school's project. As the architects of their schools initial project, site committee members orchestrated the goal development process for year two with more sophistication and knowledge than the group of faculty involved in establishing goals for a new project. However, for all projects the goal setting process was similar, that is, the discussion of problem areas, the gathering and assembling of relevant data, and the final selection of goals by an entire faculty were steps taken in each of the schools that applied for an SIPD grant. Where differences did exist, they were within each of the steps and associated most often with the level and size of the school and district, and with whether a school was applying for a new or continuation grant. Generally, a teamwork approach that emphasized the development of an overall school mission around which faculty could collaborate and plan their activities and around which individual and schoolwide efforts could be marshalled was easier to arrange and achieve in smaller schools, particularly elementary schools, and in schools that were applying for continuation grants. Developing a unity of purpose was simpler in schools where faculty shared similar beliefs and values and in schools were faculty had already had experience in a schoolwide goal setting process. As well, schools in small districts, particularly small to medium-sized schools, appeared to have a smoother time in establishing a school improvement theme with goals and objectives. Here, staff homogeneity and a school's emancipation from hierarchical control resulted in a faculty feeling enough autonomy to develop, without constraint, an

overarching school improvement theme with attendant goals and objectives. Small schools in small districts are putatively less vulnerable to problems often associated with the bureaucratic organization of large schools and districts. In the former setting, it is apparently easier to foster the teamwork and esprit de corps felt necessary to develop a vision and to plan the activities to reach it. These differences will be elaborated on in the following subsections.

Goal Setting Process

The actual goal setting process undertaken by schools applying for 2020 grants was according to interviewees, different in both substance and form from that previously experienced by faculty at the majority of schools visited. Unlike school goals that had been developed prior to HB2020, the goal development process in most schools visited involved the entire faculty and oftentimes members of the community and typically included the following steps:

1. Election or selection of a site committee
2. Discussion of problem area by entire faculty
3. Assembly of statistical data and test scores
4. Surveys of staff, students, and parents
5. Drafting of goals by the site committee
6. Final selection of the goals by the entire faculty

Site committees were responsible for overseeing this activity and, regardless of school level or type of project, approached the task with fervid determination that the interests and needs of the school would be reflected in the goal(s) selected. During interviews in each of the schools visited, site committee members described how they conducted a needs assessment that resulted in the identification of their school's SIPD goals.

Continuation and Nonfunded Projects

Schools applying for continuation grants approached the needs identification task from the perspective of needing first to assess whether progress had been made toward reaching the goals they had set for themselves during year one. Discussions among site committee members initially centered on identifying whether progress had been made and areas in which there still seemed to be problems, as well as suggestions for overcoming the problems. They focused attention on problems that could have occurred because original goals had been overly ambitious in their conceptualization, problems that may have occurred because of incongruent staff development activities, on problems created by unanticipated external constraints, and on problems related to there having been too many goals in their original project. Site committees used the needs assessment time both to reflect and review the previous years SIPD goals and accomplishments and to confer with faculty about next steps. In order to do this, they first had to grapple with reasons why some goals had been achieved and others had not. How continuation and nonfunded schools handled this task varied by school level and school size.

High schools. The organizational complexity of high schools, specifically, their potential for fragmentation, alienation, and lack of a (schoolwide) cohesive teaching community has made the goal development process at this level more cumbersome and unwieldy. At a minimum, it has been difficult to bring a large faculty together to discuss school goals. However, school size is not the only factor to be implicated in the difficulty high schools have faced in trying to set schoolwide goals. High schools are departmentalized and staffed by faculty trained in different disciplines, each with its own beliefs, values, norms of practice, and priorities. Department members comprising these distinct occupational communities speak the language of their discipline and tend to argue for goals that represent their interests. Not surprisingly, the focus generally is narrower in scope and focused on the particular needs of the department. (This is apparent as well in the final selection of goals. To accommodate department differences, goals in continuation high schools tend to focus on school governance, professional development, and on a segment of the student body, e.g. at-risk students, not on curriculum or instruction where department differences would likely surface.) Hence coming together as a whole faculty to discuss school goals is difficult both to orchestrate and to manage. Consequently, site committee members in continuation schools and the nonfunded school set about learning what their colleagues interests were by first discussing among themselves which goals from year one had been met and which had not and then organizing a variety of ways to solicit the concerns and interests of school members and the community. This included arranging for discussions to be led by site committee members at department meetings, developing surveys for students, teachers, and community members, and conducting interviews with all faculty members. Because the goal development process involved everyone, almost all interviewees were knowledgeable about the process. Although a lot of different types of information were being gathered, the goal development process was viewed as easier year two because, according to one site committee chair, "in year two people knew where they wanted to go so discussion of problems was much more focused." As well, schools had already had some experience in developing goals so the process was not new or unexpected.

In the majority of continuation schools, the site committee collated the information and prepared a summary to take back to the whole faculty for their review and final selection of goals. In one large high school, however, the Oregon Alliance (through Oregon State University) was hired to interview all faculty members and that information was taken by site committee members to a conference in Bend on restructuring schools where conference consultants assisted in the prioritization and articulation of the school's goals. According to an interviewee, as a result of this effort, the 2020 grant proposal for year two was rewritten.

As a result of the goal setting process, most schools selected a combination of new goals and continuation goals. Often the continuation goals were modified to reflect new information that had been gathered. Staff were informed of the goals in faculty meetings and by written communication. None of the continuation high schools visited had an overarching school improvement theme that had true intellectual coherence in the sense that the goals selected constituted an integrated whole. Without a well-defined mission, goals selected by continuation high schools tended to be more fragmented. For example, although a school's focus may have been on reducing the dropout rate among at-risk students, the type of goals selected--governance, professional development, and student focus--were not woven into a larger fabric where organizational means were matched to organizational ends. Problems here may lie with issues and concerns associated with the organizational complexity of high schools discussed earlier.

Middle/junior high schools. The organizational complexity associated with high schools is less often the case in middle and junior high schools, especially when there had been a decision to move from a departmentalized structure typical of junior high schools to a grade level/core subject structure associated with middle schools. Two of the continuation schools visited have moved to the new middle school organization, and the junior high school visited is a cross between the two structures. Where it exists, departmentalization is primarily in core subjects. In simplifying the organizational structure, it has been easier to bring faculty together to engage in goal setting activities. As well, schools at this level are smaller, making it possible to conduct a faculty meeting where everyone has opportunity for input. The combination of these two factors has enabled faculties to initially get together and review the degree to which goals from the previous year had been attained and, through discussion, to come to consensus about the direction the school was to take in its school improvement activities for the following year. This was true for both the continuation schools and the nonfunded school.

Using a variety of data gathered at the end of the year one project, site committees assessed their school's progress toward goal attainment and then convened a faculty meeting to discuss their findings and next steps. Discussion typically centered on a school improvement theme and the kind of goals needed to address the issue. In particular, year one goals were reviewed for their overall fit with a school improvement program and whether they should be modified or abandoned altogether. Although surveys were developed and administered to faculty and community members, interviewees noted that the goal setting process for year two was less formal than that used for year one and relied a lot on the subjective views of faculty members expressed during meetings and less on quantifiable data. If there was a recognizable pattern to the goal setting process it reflected more of an iterative process between the site committee and the larger faculty where information was exchanged and goals honed on a regular basis. Despite the more individualistic nature of information gathering, the majority of people interviewed felt they were involved in the goal setting process and their views were reflected in the development of goals for year two.

As a result of the goal setting activity that took place in each of the schools, goals selected generally were to continue working on some of year one's goals and to modify those goals where sufficient progress had not been made. Rarely was a brand new goal instituted. Schools at this level generally had from one to three goals, and they tended to be related to one another and loosely connected to an overarching school philosophy or mission. Once goals had been decided on, faculty were informed by the site committee in a faculty meeting and by written communication.

Elementary schools. More than any of the other two levels, elementary schools tend to operate as a family. Their size and homogeneity among staff (in terms of similarity in educational preparation), as well as having had experience in working together on goal development and project implementation this last year made it relatively easy for elementary schools to come together and develop goals for year two. Using the faculty meeting as the most appropriate venue for discussing project goals, staff, led by site committee members, looked first at their former goals vis-a-vis their school improvement program data (e.g., test data, surveys) that had been gathered during year one and then determined next steps, or as one interviewee said, "asked themselves what they could do better."

The extent to which a school had a cogently-designed and well-articulated school improvement program made a difference in the ease faculties had with this stage of project development. A

coherent school improvement program augured well for assembling relevant data to develop or refine goals that could serve as organizational means to an organizational mission. Here, what mattered was that goals--regardless of whether they were new, the same as in year one, or a modification of last year's--fit together and represent a coherent sense of purpose. This often resulted in a school having multiple related goals. An example of a project with an overarching school improvement theme that was used to guide project development was in a small elementary school in a small district. The school improvement program focused on the improvement of student performance in writing through four related goals that dealt with instructional practices, writing assessment, staff development training to expand teachers' knowledge of educational theories and practices related to writing curriculum and writing assessment, and establishing procedures to guide community involvement in the schoolwide focus on improving student performance in writing. Site committee members indicated that they felt they had the full support and encouragement of their principal/superintendent to "thing big," that is, to develop a comprehensive program improvement plan. Not surprisingly, all interviewees in this school could discuss not only the goal development process but the relationship of the goals to the school's school improvement program.

In a similar vein, one of the nonfunded schools decided to move from its past school improvement focus on writing assessment to that of teaching thinking and writing skills to students. As a group, staff concluded that a logical next step in their school improvement program was to focus their efforts on learning how to instruct students in the area of thinking and writing. Goals developed by the faculty focused on this theme and included staff development training in instructional practices to teach thinking and writing.

By way of contrast, an elementary school in a medium-sized district had three major goals that were not concatenated to an overarching school improvement theme or plan. Although the site committee had worked hard to bring the school together, faculty members had been unable to cohere around school improvement issues or to develop an overall school mission. Major concerns at this school centered instead on personnel problems that had been escalating over the last year. At the time of the site visit faculty expressed concern about a possible mutiny. The splintered goals, while each an important issue in its own right, reflected, and was perhaps symptomatic of, the difficulty the faculty had in being able to work together in the development of a schoolwide project.

In sum, elementary schools with a clear vision of where they wanted to go and with a staff that shared beliefs in the central school mission were able to develop clear goals to guide them there. Faculties worked together using the faculty meeting as the setting to brainstorm and prioritize salient ideas and issues and to develop a school improvement program with related goals and activities. In schools without an overall sense of mission or unity of purpose and a commitment among faculty the goal development process resulted in goals that were fragmented and that hung together only loosely, if at all.

New Projects

The goal development process in newly funded schools is quite similar to that followed by continuation schools, with the exception of the step involving the evaluation of prior goals, and is nearly identical to steps followed by continuation sites last year prior to their being funded. Also the same as last year's new sites is the level of enthusiasm exuded by faculty during interviews.

Indeed, faculty in newly funded schools exhibited a fervor that matched the level of enthusiasm expressed by continuation sites last year. There is, without question, a special feeling engendered in schools where faculty have worked together, often for the first time, in developing school improvement goals. The goal development process pulls disparate groups together and with the direction provided by site committees sets the foundation for the beginning of site-based management in a school. Site committees were instrumental in making this process happen. How the newly funded sites handled this task varies, again by school level. The small sample (only one new elementary and one new high school were visited) precludes any analysis by school size.

High school. According to interviewees, the goal setting process at this small high school closely resembled the way staff have selected their yearly school goals. Hence staff were familiar with and comfortable working together on issues that concern the school and its community.

Despite its relatively small size (approximately 333 students) , faculty did not just meet as one group to discuss goals. Faculty are departmentalized by discipline and the issues associated with a school having distinct occupational communities were also present here suggesting that the organizational structure of high schools (predicated on the disciplinary training of teachers) is a more powerful determinant of behavior than school size alone. Consequently, site committee members used department meetings, surveys, and faculty meetings to solicit the staffs' concerns about school-related issues that needed to be addressed. According to interviewees, there was a lot of faculty involvement in this stage of project development. Site committee members organized and analyzed the information gathered from these different sources and established priorities for the staff to review. In an itera.. e process involving the site committee and the faculty, goals were refined. Staff were informed of their SIPD goals in a faculty meeting and by written communication.

Although the school's size is closer to the enrollment of an elementary school, it is possible that the organizational complexity of high schools discussed earlier makes development of an overarching framework that could be used to guide the development of related goals a more complicated task for faculty. An alternative for high schools facing this difficulty is for them to develop a long-range school improvement plan that focuses attention on a set of generic skills that apply to all disciplines (e.g., writing, higher order thinking skills) with goals delineated for year one, year two, etc.. Adjustments and modifications could be made at the end of each year. By developing a central theme and then seeing long instead of wide, it may be easier to concatenate related goals over a period of time greater than one school year, rather than trying to attempt a lot in a short duration of time. Accommodating differences has seemingly forced high schools to think wide at the expense of creating a coherent sense of purpose. Missing is a well-defined mission.

Middle/junior high schools. The goal development process in the four new schools at this level involved nearly every faculty member in each of the schools as well as interested members of the community. Interviewees repeatedly commented that the process employed in selecting their school's goals was different from any previous experience they had in identifying school goals. For several schools, goals had been previously "handed down," that is, faculty had been told what the schools goals were by the administrators who had formulated them. In one school, interviewees noted that goals had never been developed before so the experience of there even being schools goals was novel.

Site committee members took responsibility in each of the schools to gather pertinent information for this stage of project development. In all schools, data were collected from a variety of different sources that included, for example, surveys to students, parents, teachers, and administrators, student logs and journals, different kinds of test data (e.g., achievement, writing) student and teacher demographic data (e.g., student discipline referrals, student attendance data, number of sick days used by teachers, etc.), interviews with teachers, department meetings, and faculty meetings. According to interviewees, the purpose of generating such a large data base was to be able to adequately assess how their schools were doing in all areas. Apparently staff in some schools had been told that "with 2020, the possibilities are limitless." Encouraged to think big, site committees went about collecting data with zest and a determination to cover the entire landscape. Site committees collated the data and developed priorities and then shared the information with either the entire faculty, departments, or task forces that had been established specifically for the purpose of developing goals. For example, in one middle school, the site committee identified priorities from the data, took the information to the faculty for discussion and then took a consensus vote to determine where the school's focus should be. Areas where faculty had full agreement became the school's 2020 goals. In another school, interviewees talked about having divided into teams to discuss the data that had been amassed and to develop priorities. They then returned to a large faculty setting for further discussion. Site committees took the information gleaned from this setting and developed a survey which they took back to the teams. Teams were asked to priority-order the areas and the identically top ranked items became the school's goals.

Goals developed using the methods described resulted in the direction schools would take in their school improvement project. In essence, the goals themselves became the school's SIPD program. One school, however, went about the process differently by first developing a vision statement as a group and using the site committee to operationalize the statement into goals. Here, a well-defined mission drove the generation of goals and attendant activities.

In summary, in all of the schools visited, the goals developed reflected a lot of involvement by faculty and often community members and represented the interests and concerns of most staff members. Site committees took great care in gathering relevant information from a wide variety of sources and assumed responsibility for writing the goals. Faculty were informed of the final selection of goals in faculty meetings and by written communication.

Elementary school. A faculty brainstorming session dedicated to addressing the question "what can be done to improve our school?" was the vehicle used for initially gathering information to develop the school's improvement focus. Small resource committees then took the ideas and developed a theme from which goals were generated. The faculty then reconvened to review the general direction that had surfaced as a top priority (which, interestingly, is the direction the district is heading) and the goals that had been selected. According to all interviewees, there was a lot of faculty involvement and direction provided by the site committee.

Changes in Goal Setting Processes

It is clear from talking to faculty in the 24 schools that, compared to their previous experiences (prior to HB2020) in school goal setting activities, there has been a substantial increase in the amount and type of activity related to goal setting, as well as improvement in the degree of collaboration surrounding matters of educational goal setting since the start of the SIPD project.

Without question, faculty at all levels in both continuation and new schools were responsible for establishing the goals for their projects and, in the case of continuation sites, for evaluating whether goals from year one had been reached.

The fact that SIPD goals were, according to interviewees, "their goals" distinguishes SIPD goals from the majority of goals many of the schools had prior to HB2020. Indeed, in prior years, most goals adopted as school goals had been district goals or an adaptation of the district's goals and the goal development process was, according to teachers, little more than a sanctioning of these goals. According to interviewees, previous school goals generally were abstract or vague and not meaningful in the sense that teachers knew how to reach the goals. Even though principals of SIPD schools were actively involved in school improvement activities and in particular were credited with having a clear vision of where they wanted to take the school and the knowledge of how to get there, interviewees kept coming back to the fact that the SIPD goals were "their goals," not administrator's or central office's goals, and that this is what made SIPD projects different. Moreover, because of their involvement in the goal development process, most interviewees said they had a general sense of how they were going to reach the goals. This was particularly true in sites that had a clearly defined, coherent school improvement program.

The extent to which a school had a carefully articulated central school mission made a difference in its ability to assemble relevant data to develop or refine goals that could serve as organizational means to an organizational end. In schools with an overarching school improvement theme or plan what mattered in the development of goals was that they fit together and represent a coherent sense of purpose. Small to medium-sized elementary and middle/junior high schools had an easier time developing and working from this type of goal development model. School size and homogeneity among staff, as well as prior experience in developing school goals, are factors that likely enable this to occur. High schools, by way of comparison, generally did not have an organizing template and this resulted in the development of more fragmented unrelated goals. Organizational diversity accounts in large part for this difference in goal development. High schools are structurally differentiated organizations with faculty representing diverse backgrounds. Such circumstances have resulted in a greater tendency toward the development of multiple goals that represent the interests and concerns of different constituencies. The goals developed generally are more diffuse, and they have tended to be more process oriented (e.g., with a governance focus, with a professional development focus) rather than focusing on academic excellence. In these schools, interviewees were less likely to be able to cite the goals as much as they could discuss the goal development process and their involvement in a variety of professional development activities to reach one or more of the goals.

In sum, goal development in each of the schools visited was a dynamic process that was orchestrated by site committees. All faculty members were involved, although involvement was handled differently in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools. Faculty members attributed their level of commitment to reaching the goals to their influence and involvement in the goal development process.

Assessment of Educational Progress of School Programs and Students

Overview

One of the components necessary for an effective school improvement project is a system of accountability that will enable both the participants and their audiences to know how well the project is meeting its intended purpose. Consequently, schools must have not only a clear picture of their goals but a way to measure progress toward meeting these objectives and a way to determine if goals have been met. Assessment of a school's school improvement project thus takes place at several intervals in a project's implementation. Stakeholders interested in a project's outcome will focus their attention on whether the project's goals have been attained. Data collected during the course of a project are also important because they can assist project decision makers in formulating mid-course changes and corrections that may be necessary to reach project goals.

SIPD schools are required at the time of proposal development to identify how progress toward goal attainment will be measured and how they will determine if goals have been met. In particular, as the architects of their school's 2020 projects, site committees have been delegated responsibility for establishing the indicators to be used to assess their project's progress in meeting goals and objectives and the decision criteria for judging whether goals have been attained. Hence, indicators selected are to be matched to the goals selected in the sense that the data gathered for the purpose of determining goal attainment actually provide adequate and accurate information on which to make a judgement.

SIPD schools have been involved in assessing if their project goals are being met; however, this area has posed more problems for schools than any other feature of HB2020. While most schools at all levels have experienced difficulty in this area, schools with continuation projects--and particularly those with well-defined and coherent school improvement projects--have had fewer problems than newly funded schools. The section of the interview protocol dealing with assessment activities frequently led respondents to ask interviewers what was meant by some of the questions, particularly the question asking about information collected to determine progress toward reaching the school's 2020 goals. The greatest difficulty came in relating assessment activities being undertaken in a school to measuring goal attainment. In most cases, interviewees' level of awareness and understanding corresponded with their role in the project's implementation, to the clarity of the project goals, and to individuals' past experience with assessment and evaluation activities. Individuals closer to the design and implementation of their project--usually the site committee members--generally had a better grasp of the role of assessment and evaluation and the data being gathered.

Site committee members were generally able to identify specific practices being employed to measure progress toward goal attainment, e.g., collecting and scoring writing samples, documenting patterns of student absenteeism and discipline referrals, identifying the number of participants attending workshops and conferences, examining student test scores in certain areas, etc., and to discuss how the practices either were or could be used to make modifications and adjustments in their project's goals. Sophistication in knowledge and its application increased with experience resulting in site committee members in continuation projects being

appreciably more informed about and comfortable with assessment activities and their relationship to the evaluation of project goal attainment than site committee members in new projects. This was also true for non-site committee members. Non-site committee members in most of the continuation projects could talk about assessment practices, whereas non-site committee members in all new projects had the vaguest understanding of assessment and evaluation activities. The nature and extent of one's knowledge about and implementation of assessment and evaluation practices in SIPD schools thus varied by one's proximity to the project, clarity of the project, and to one's past experience in project development and implementation. Level of awareness and implementation of assessment activities in nonfunded schools were contingent on the degree to which a project was actually being implemented. In schools where projects were being implemented, data gathering was done informally. The differences briefly described above will be explored more fully in the sections that follow.

Continuation Projects

In comparison to a year ago when site visits were first made to 2020 schools, discussions with faculty in those schools this year yielded a much different picture. The depth and breadth of their understanding about the relationship between assessment and evaluation activities and their project's goals was generally much greater. In elementary schools and middle/junior high schools in particular, both site and non-site committee members were able to talk about data that were being collected to measure progress in goal attainment and, importantly, how data were being used. A year ago, by contrast, this subject was met with uncertainty and confusion.

According to interviewees, their knowledge had increased as a result of several factors. First, there was a more relaxed school environment during year two (particularly in schools that had elected to divide their funding over a two-year period), which allowed faculty to spend more time in areas that had been given short shrift in year one. The whirl of seemingly non-stop professional development activity during year one had occupied the attention and energy of most faculty interviewed last year. Second, year two was considered "the implementation year." This year schools were dedicated to actually applying the skills faculty had acquired through a variety of professional development activities last year, and this required bringing the project into the school and the classroom. Doing so demanded that faculty know how to gather information to ensure that project goals were being reached. Not surprisingly, this was far easier in schools with a coherent school improvement project. Third, with a year of experience behind them faculty felt sanguine about managing the implementation of a project that was theirs, and this included feeling more self-assured and thus competent about how to evaluate their project. As a consequence of these factors, interviewees were able to move with relative ease from a discussion about data collected prior to year two to establish areas of need to a discussion about the kind of data being collected during the current school year to measure progress toward goal attainment and how data were being used. Many individuals were themselves gathering data in their classrooms which were then used by site committee members in assessing the school's progress in reaching specific goals. For example, a non-site committee member in a small elementary school described how each classroom teacher was responsible for a writing process time during each week. Writing samples were collected two to three times during the year and the information gleaned form the scoring was used to evaluate the school's goals. According to this interviewee, "the faculty is going through the evaluation process very carefully."

The finding that interviewees were familiar with the kind of data being collected at their school during the course of the year was especially true at the elementary and middle/junior high school levels in schools with an overarching school improvement program that was academically focused. Here goals were clearly tied to a program, and faculty members saw their role and responsibility in achieving the goals in the project and in gathering information to be used to assess progress being made to reach the goals. For interviewees in these sites, the data collected usually had a relationship to assessing whether goals had been reached. Where confusion arose, it had to do with interviewees being uncertain about how some kinds of data, e.g., surveys, could be used to measure goal attainment. The link was too nebulous. In these cases specifically and in all cases generally, the extent to which an evaluation consultant or specific individuals on a site committee had responsibility for overseeing the evaluation of the project made a difference in interviewees' level of understanding. These individuals educated the faculty about assessment and evaluation activities and their relationship to measuring goal attainment.

In addition to this difference from year one, there was an increase in the level of sophistication among interviewees as to how data were actually being used. It is one thing to be knowledgeable about assessment activities; it is another to understand how the data are used and then to actually use the information to make changes in a project. Individuals at all levels talked about the utility of the information being gathered from a number of sources. In one elementary school kindergarten teachers described their "self-esteem curriculum" and how the information they gathered from observing students reactions to and interactions with one another was used to guide their discussions during parent conferences. The principal in this school also commented on the effects of the program in terms of the decrease in the number of discipline referrals. He had documented the number of discipline referrals on a month-by-month basis prior and subsequent to the implementation of the curriculum and had noticed a sharp decline in referral rates (except around holidays) and had used the information in discussions and brainstorming sessions with faculty. At a middle school both site and non-site committee members talked about the school's use of writing assessment data to modify classroom practices. In this case, one of the school's goals focused on improvement in student writing, and data gathered were used to identify areas in need of improvement. High schools reported similar experiences in the utility of the data being collected, however, the level of knowledge about assessment activities in general was greater among site committee members than among non-site committee members. This partly has to do with the difficulty of disseminating this kind of information to a large group of individuals. Just bringing them together for this type of discussion can be an overwhelming task. And partly the problem resides in the nature of 2020 projects in high schools: They are predominantly driven by individual goals that are not generally part of an integrated whole. Thus, the nature of one's involvement is structurally fragmented from the beginning, and for the most part, only those involved directly in the attainment of a particular goal are acquainted with its assessment activities. Familiarity with data collection, then, is centered on one's involvement in goal-related activities and does not necessarily extend to an understanding beyond this, i.e., to the project as a whole. Despite this tendency toward myopia, high school level interviewees did exhibit an increased understanding of assessment activities this year than they had last year, with the level of awareness being greater for site committee members.

In sum, interviewees in schools with continuation projects were appreciably more informed about assessment and evaluation activities related to their SIPD project this year than they were when interviewed last year. Interviewees at all levels were able to describe data gathering efforts and how data were being used to assess progress toward reaching goals and changes in practices

that had resulted from analyzing the data they had collected. Individuals attributed the change from year one to year two to several factors that were related to both the actual project and themselves. The fact that year two was for most sites "the implementation year" made it easier to identify indicators of change and to focus attention on evaluation, and the fact that people had a year of experience made them more comfortable and confident of their ability to gather data and to know how to use the information collected.

New Projects

The relatively low level of awareness of and knowledge about assessment and evaluation activities among site and non-site committee interviewees in schools with new projects closely resembles that found a year ago during site visits to new schools. Unfortunately, however, the small number of new schools visited this year, particularly at the elementary and high school levels, precludes a comprehensive analysis of this aspect of the SIPD projects in the six new schools. Nevertheless, despite the small sample, a finding that surfaced in the analysis of interviews for continuation projects and that appeared in the analysis of interviews from a middle school with a new project will be used to frame the discussion and bring clarity to why new projects are so different from continuation projects with respect to interviewees' understanding of assessment and evaluation activities.

As noted previously, one's experience with and proximity to the design and implementation of a project accounted for the increased knowledge and understanding of all facets of project assessment and evaluation in continuation schools. In addition, actual project implementation made a difference in interviewees' level of awareness of the relationship between data gathering efforts and how data were being used to assess progress in attaining project goals. The fact that a concrete project was being put into place made it easier to identify indicators of change. In contrast, the "getting ready stage" typical of a project's first year has been too abstract for most interviewees to hold onto in their discussions about assessment. This was clear at all levels and was most pronounced in schools without a coherent school improvement program. By and large, interviewees in these schools were simply not aware of what was being done to evaluate their project or to determine if SIPD goals had been reached. Although they could identify certain practices, e.g., keeping a wellness log, documenting who attended what professional development activities, collecting test data, administering a survey to staff, students, and community members, etc., most interviewees had only the vaguest understanding of how these data were going to be used.

This was not the case in the middle school that found itself implementing its project during year one. According to site committee interviewees, they thought all SIPD schools did it this way. Everyone interviewed was dancing so fast that they did not realize that they were doing two years worth of activities in one year. Complicating matters, yet seemingly not dissuading anyone, were three additional factors: this school had learned it had received a 2020 grant when the school year was just beginning and thus had, in facultys' eyes, some catch-up work to do, the school was implementing an Onward to Excellence (OTE) project concurrent with their 2020 project, and the school had a new principal. Despite what could have slowed up a process or in some cases even killed it, interviewees discussed how they had designed a study skills program that included several components, had trained individuals to work with students in the labs, and were collecting data to document how the study skills program was doing. Every interviewee could discuss the program, the data being collected (students' grades, attendance, work completed, progress in

homework, and teacher opinion sheets on each student in the program), and how the data were being used. Whether data were actually being used to modify elements of their project is difficult to know because of the hurried nature of the project. The problems this school faced were how to maintain the energy level and enthusiasm of site committee members so as to sustain the momentum established and to spread project responsibility among more faculty--not how to increase individuals' knowledge about assessment and evaluation.

When considering the importance of addressing how schools can assess and evaluate their project's first year in a way that is meaningful for everyone, the fact that a concrete, tangible experience seems to have made a difference for one new school is very telling. It suggests that part of the difficulty faced by new schools, especially those without a coherent, well-articulated school improvement program, is how to design concrete goals and assessment activities in tandem. Since they operate in reciprocal fashion, at the time goals are developed, assessment activities should also be developed. The link cannot be oblique. Optimally, there should be an overarching school improvement program that guides the development of goals and assessment activities and all faculty should be involved in this stage of project development.

The issue for new schools, then, is to streamline their data collection efforts to match their goals and to make the relationship between the two clear. Contrary to views expressed by some interviewees that it was too early to collect data or that it was too early to note change, with proper training in assessment and evaluation techniques, it is neither too early nor too premature to develop qualitative and quantitative indicators of outcomes and to note change no matter how incremental or subtle it may be. For example, qualitative measures could focus on school and classroom processes and student and parent responses to new initiatives. Given the importance of evaluating different stages of project implementation, faculties should be encouraged to devote more attention to this area.

Nonfunded Projects

In the four schools with nonfunded projects, some assessment activities were taking place in three, and none were occurring in one school. The nature and extent of data collected were related to the degree to which a project was actually being implemented. This ranged from nearly complete implementation in one elementary school to what appeared to be random implementation in another elementary school. In between was a high school that was attempting to collect data related to the goal identified in its continuation project proposal and a middle school where site committee members were collecting data informally in an attempt to keep their project alive.

The key to a successfully organized data collection effort was a principal who had remained committed to the project and/or a cohesive site committee that had remained committed to the project. One elementary school had neither, and as one former site committee member commented, "[you] need leadership to do or call for it, and we have a new principal who is not committed to our project." Although some elements of last year's project are being implemented in some classrooms, no data are being collected. The middle school has had a strong, active site committee that has been tracking the number of student detentions, absences, discipline referrals, and in-house suspensions in an effort to see if change had occurred as a result of implementing a self-esteem program. This had been one of the school's SIPD goals planned for year two and continues to be an interest among faculty. The principal of the high school has

remained committed to reducing the dropout rate among at-risk students in his school and is collecting attendance data on students and has asked teachers to send problem students to him. However, according to interviewees, interest and enthusiasm among faculty are at best erratic, and it has been difficult to get the project off the ground. The principal has apparently been unable over time to kindle the spirit of the entire faculty in an area he feels is important. The remaining elementary school is an example of a school with the key ingredients necessary to keep a nonfunded project not only alive but moving. As noted in the discussion on goal development, the faculty at this school decided to move from its original interest in learning how to assess students' writing to that of learning how to teach thinking and writing skills to students. According to an interviewee, "the school used to work on writing globally, and teachers now work on one area at a time until students achieve a reasonable mastery of an area. Using data collected prior to year two, the school is now able to focus on specific areas of need." The principal and the site committee have been the key to this happening. Teachers are receiving training (to be discussed in the section on professional development activities), and they are collecting writing samples. According to an interviewee, "the writing samples are used to modify instruction in writing and thinking acquisition." All faculty have been involved in the project, and although it is going at a slower pace because of the lack of funding, faculty are committed to carrying out the intent of the project. The project goal is an extension of a district goal, so in addition to principal support and encouragement, the district has also supported the school's mission.

In sum, it is clear in reviewing the interviews conducted at nonfunded sites that despite the fact that SIPD money had not been forthcoming, the work done in preparation of each school's continuation project application has been the springboard for continuing with as many aspects of a project as are possible. The key to this endeavor appears to be a strongly committed principal and/or site committee; without either, the foundation has been weakened and as seen in one school, it has been nearly impossible to keep the project intact. And without a project, there is no data collection to assess goal attainment.

Changes in Assessment and Evaluation Activities

A year ago SIPD schools at all levels struggled with a requirement in the legislation that charged sites with the responsibility for assessing their project's progress in attaining its goals. When interviewed last year, both site and non-site committee members had a difficult time holding onto any discussion that called for them to relate their data collection activities to measuring progress in achieving the goals they had set for themselves. Most project participants were unable to articulate how they were intending to evaluate whether change had occurred as a result of project activities and if project goals had been reached. They could identify certain data gathering practices, e.g., collecting writing samples, examining students' test scores in certain areas, identifying the number of participants attending workshops and conferences, collecting data on student absenteeism, etc., but could not articulate how these data were to be used. This finding was true for sites at all levels, although site committee members tended to be more knowledgeable than non-site committee members, especially at the elementary and middle/junior high school levels. Given the importance that a system of accountability be in place and used, a recommendation was made that all SIPD sites be required to receive training in the areas of assessment and evaluation.

A return to 14 of the schools visited last year indicated that in a year's time, with no identifiable training, project participants in the majority of schools could hold lucid conversations about a subject that had been met with uncertainty and confusion only a year before. Interviewees explained that project activities were different year two and the differences resulted in their being more confident and competent to carry out assessment and evaluation responsibilities. According to interviewees, their knowledge about and understanding of assessment and evaluation activities as they related to measuring change had increased as a result of several factors. First, there was a more relaxed school environment in year two, and participants could engage in project activities that had been given short shrift during year one. Second, year two was their "implementation year," specifically, it was the time to put the project pieces together into an integrated whole. With a tangible project in place, faculty were able to identify indicators of change that could be used to assess the effects of their project. Third, a year of experience in project design and implementation gave participants the confidence that they could carry out the requirements of HB 2020. As a consequence of these factors, both site and non-site interviewees, particularly those at schools with a coherent school improvement program, were able to talk about assessment and evaluation activities in their schools--specifically what data were being collected and how they were being used. This was especially true at the elementary and middle school levels and less so at high schools where projects were defined more by their individual goals than by an overarching school improvement theme.

Visits this year to schools with new projects provided an experience of deja vu. Conversations with site and non-site committee members in five out of the six schools echoed what was heard last year. The sixth new school illuminated why schools with continuation projects had been able to make the kind of changes from year one to year two that they noted in their discussions. One middle school had decided to do what was typically accomplished in two years in one year, and was actually implementing its project. The concreteness of the project made it possible for faculty to identify indicators of change, to collect relevant data, and to know how to use the data . The difficulty (other) schools with new projects were having was related to how to develop indicators of change for goals that were process oriented (e.g., with a governance focus, with a professional development focus) or that were abstract. (This problem has also arisen in schools with continuation projects, specifically high schools. In these schools, these kinds of goals <u>are</u> often the project in the sense that there is not coherent school improvement program that weaves these goals into an integrated whole. Professional development goals and governance goals that are concatenated to a larger organizational mission do not pose this problem.) Once a project had been concretized and put into place the task was, according to interviewees, a lot easier.

In light of the importance of developing and implementing a system of accountability and of what is known about the difference in practices in schools with new and continuation projects, it is important that schools with new projects learn to design concrete goals and assessment activities in tandem, not in isolation from one another. This is particularly important for the types of goals schools are developing for their first year. Of even greater importance, however, is development of a school improvement project that represents an integrated whole. Goals and the means for assessing progress toward reaching the goals need to be related to a unified program. Last year an evaluation consultant in one school had assisted faculty in developing such a program, and it made a difference in interviewees' level of knowledge and understanding and in their ability to discuss assessment activities in relation to their project's goal attainment.

As a final note, schools with nonfunded projects generally are collecting data only informally and, with the exception of one elementary school that is implementing its project, data are not being

used to assess progress toward goal attainment. School leadership and a strong cohesive site committee are credited with the extent to which a project is being implemented and to any data collection activities that are being undertaken.

School-Based Management

Overview

One of the major thrusts of the SIPD program was to move schools in the direction of school-based management. As a locally implemented collaborative management system, this meant having the faculty actively share in the educational planning and decision making of the school.

The major rationale for implementing school-based management was the belief that the closer to students decisions are made which affect them, the more likely it is that the decision will truly serve the students. With adequate authority at the school level, many important decisions affecting personnel, curriculum, and the use of resources can be made by people who are in the best position to make them. Through the implementation of site committees composed of a principal, teachers, classified staff, parents, community members, and occasionally students, individuals work together on the attainment of school-related goals. This typically has included responsibility for deciding on the goals to their actual implementation and evaluation. By employing the vehicles of participation--open communication, interdependent responsibilities, team decision making, and problem solving, individuals involved in school-based management are expected to feel a heightened sense of joint involvement and contribution to decisions. At the school organization level, implementing some form of school-based management was intended to result in a more cohesive organization with highly integrated work teams, good intergroup relations, less conflict, and greater focus, and consensus on organizational goals.

Variation in the structure and operation of school-based management programs among the SIPD schools was produced by the process of local needs assessment and program planning. District organization imperatives and constraints and contingencies imposed by the larger environment in which the district operates also contributed to differences in the design and implementation of school-based management programs.

Interviewees in the 24 schools visited were asked general questions relating to the design and operation of their school's site-based management system. In addition, they were asked to talk specifically about the nature and extent of collaboration and decision opportunities in their school and whether there had been a change in the locus of control over key decision domains that affect the work lives of teachers.

Because the institutional context in which schools operate and school leadership surfaced last year as critical variables in a school's ability to operate autonomously, principals were asked this year to discuss their leadership role vis-a-vis the larger set of conditions (e.g., central office, superintendent, community, institutional and regulatory agencies) that affect and influence the operation of their school. The intent here was to work our way out of the school and into the school environment where many of the forces that shape school organization can be found. To assess a school's autonomy from this broader perspective principals were asked their perceptions about: 1) the amount of control external authorities had on how their school was run; 2) the degree of social homogeneity within the community (i.e., whether there was broad agreement and support throughout the community about basic matters of education); and, 3) the extent to which the school represented a turbulent versus a stable social environment (i.e., whether the school was plagued by problems such as poor academic performance, high turnover

among students, drugs, absenteeism, high drop-out rates or whether it was in a problem-free environment). Finally, principals were asked to evaluate their own influence over organization issues such as establishing curriculum, determining instructional methods, allocating school resources, setting policy, etc. Together, this information provides a larger context for understanding why some schools have been more successful than others in implementing an effective site-based management system.

The Role of the Principal

The Elements of School Leadership

Schools work in complex environments that impose all sorts of demands. Parents have countless ideas about what schools should do, and all schools must take parents into account. All schools have governing boards whose demands schools are obligated to meet. And, all schools are surrounded by some sort of administrative apparatus that sees to it that the demands of local, and increasingly, federal and state authorities, are carried out. The problem for schools and for principals in particular is that there is no guarantee that this welter of demands will be consistent in any way with effective schools. Indeed, the demands are likely to be inconsistent with the development and operation of an effective school organization.

As the leaders of schools, principals are the individuals responsible for deciding how to respond to the barrage of demands from authorities and interests on the outside and how to balance these requests with the needs and interests of individuals in the schools. They must decide which demands to deflect and which ones to accommodate, and they must be able to protect the people in the schools--namely teachers--from the kinds of demands that make it difficult for schools to operate on a professional basis. Strong discretionary leadership is thus a necessary prerequisite to the operation of an effective school organization.

One of the distinctive characteristics of SIPD schools is leadership, specifically principals, who in the eyes of their staff are strong educational leaders. These principals, according to interviewees, have a clear vision of where they want to take their school and the clear knowledge of how to get there. As judged by their own staff, principals of SIPD schools exhibited an array of leadership qualities--knowledge of school problems, openness with staff, clarity of strength and purpose, and a willingness to innovate. They were able to articulate clear goals, exercise strong instructional leadership, and held high expectations and respect for students and teachers. Because of these qualities, many interviewees commented that their SIPD project was a natural extension of the direction their school was already heading, and they attributed this to the role their principal had taken with regard to overall school improvement--not just those elements of their SIPD project. Faculty members also perceived that their principal was able to deal effectively with the demands and pressures from parents, with excessive administrative burdens, and with exigencies posed by the community. Importantly, interviewees also noted that their principals took pride in their schools and were inclined to grant teachers substantial autonomy in their own spheres of expertise, to encourage their participation in decision making about important matters of school policy, and to promote a context of interaction, exchange of ideas, and mutual respect. In sum, principals in the majority of SIPD schools treated their staff as true professionals and were able to build their schools around their professionalism.

These findings were consistent across all levels of schools with both new and continuation projects, as well as for two of the nonfunded sites (one elementary school and the middle school). School leadership was viewed as critical to schools being able to reach the goals they had set for themselves. However, the analysis of the interviews of principals indicates that there were differences in principals' ability to keep a school focused on its mission, to work effectively with parents and community, to motivate teachers, to marshall necessary resources, and the like. The characteristics of principals cited by interviewees were easier for principals to achieve in some schools than in others. The differences, according to principals, were related to the mix of people in the school and the conditions outside the school. During interviews principals were asked to talk about their leadership role in a context larger than just describing the internal operation of their school with respect to their SIPD project. Specifically, they were asked about the relationship between events inside the school and the conditions outside the school. In response, principals talked about the community in which their school was nested and the roles of central office and the superintendent and the larger institutional environment in the operation of their school. Most principals interviewed felt they had enough autonomy and trust to conduct the affairs of their schools. This included, for example, having sufficient influence to establish curriculum, determine instructional methods, allocate school resources, and set policy. Having adequate autonomy made a difference with regard to what they felt they could accomplish as principals, namely, they could grant teachers' substantial autonomy to do their work. The nature and extent of teachers' autonomy was thus related to the school's autonomy. The greater autonomy a principal felt a school had, the more likely the principal was to be able to create a professional environment for teachers. This autonomy translated into teachers being actively involved in decisions that affected their work.

Within the school, the size of and homogeneity among faculty noted in an earlier discussion, as well as how long staff had worked together themselves and with their principal, were related to principals granting teachers autonomy. It appears that there is greater solidarity among faculty with similar backgrounds who have worked together for some time, and principals seemed more receptive to devolving key decisions to teachers when these conditions were present. Not surprisingly, the school's climate is greatly enhanced when this occurs.

Outside the school, a school's autonomy was not related just to a progressively minded superintendent and central office staff, and principals were acutely aware of this in their discussions about the larger environment in which schools operate. The behavior of superintendents and central office staff are influenced by conditions present in the school's (and district's) environment, namely the homogeneity of the community and the absence of serious problems that the school (and/or district) cannot handle itself. When a school was located in a community where there were no serious conflicts of interest about important educational issues and no serious problems that the school could not solve itself, a school was more autonomous and, in turn, teachers were more autonomous. In schools where there was broad agreement in the community about basic matters of educational policy, and where problems could be resolved using the resources available, principals felt they were in charge, as did teachers. This was most often the case in small to medium-sized schools in small to medium-sized districts. Principals in these schools spoke of the support they received from the community and the involvement of parents in school activities. This was particularly true in elementary schools and was highlighted during a conversation with the elementary principal of one of the nonfunded projects. She spoke about the broad base of support within the school's community for activities in the school and noted, as an illustration of the support, the ease with which the district had recently been able to pass both a tax base and a facilities bond. Staff in this school credited their principal with the

latitude they had in making decisions that affected their work lives and for being instrumental in keeping their 2020 project alive.

By way of contrast, schools (and districts) plagued by problems such as an unstable financial situation, poor academic performance, drugs, absenteeism, high dropout rates, and poor social behavior, and that are located in heterogeneous communities where dissension among community members over school-related issues is high, are more inclined to be regulated and controlled. This control is imposed partly by the requirements of programs targeted to eliminate or reduce the effects of these problems and partly by a central office and superintendent that are responsible for administering and managing the programs. In schools with these characteristics autonomy was more restricted. This situation was likelier to occur in medium to large schools, particularly high schools and some middle/junior high schools, in large urban districts (or districts having urban-like demographic characteristics) where in addition to managing the requirements of myriad federal and state programs, administrators must play to a heterogeneous constituency. Central control is greater in these kinds of environments. In these kinds of sites, a school's autonomy rested on the principal's ability to insulate staff from outside problems, to keep peace within the community, and to negotiate latitude over school decisions with central office administrators. The nature and extent of teacher autonomy in these schools also corresponded to the school's autonomy. Principals in these kinds of schools were more apt to talk about pockets of support in their community, but were also quick to point out that the nature of the support was not financial. Principals also talked about the increase in the number of at-risk students and changes in the composition of the community (e.g., more "dysfunctional families"). Several SIPD projects were designed around helping the at-risk student population. In these schools it was not uncommon to hear interviewees talk about developing and implementing programs to help increase students' self-esteem, to improve students' academic performance in certain subjects, to keep students in school, and the like.

In summary, the qualities imputed to principals of SIPD schools last year and again this year appear to be related both to one's personality and, importantly, to the extant set of conditions within and outside the school. The presence of both is apparently necessary for school and teacher autonomy to exist.

School Leadership and Project Development Implementation

In schools where faculty felt they worked as a team, where the principal was perceived more as leading and collaborating than managing, teachers in schools with new projects identified the principal as the key to having been awarded the school's SIPD grant. According to interviewees in these schools, principals were instrumental in allocating the critical resources of time and personnel to enable staff to work together on their project application. With a collaborative working relationship in place, the stage had been set for their working together after the grant had been awarded. Teachers were able to operate as a true community of professionals. With rare exception, interviewees associated the success of this collaborative work environment to their principal. Comments such as "people oriented," "process oriented," and "invested in school improvement" were common descriptors of principals in SIPD schools. In schools with continuation projects, principals were identified as the "keeper of the dream," helping staff to overcome temporary disappointments or setbacks by maintaining the vision and reinforcing the unity of purpose. In working together as a community of professionals, staff reported that

schoolwide decisions related to project development and implementation were, when feasible, reached by discussion and consensus. Principals in continuation sites encouraged teachers to participate in planning and policy making and continued to make that a school, not just a project, priority.

Although site committees were viewed most often as the catalyst for the project-related school improvement change process being undertaken in their school, it was the principal who was widely regarded as the key to school improvement. This was almost universally the case in elementary schools, particularly elementary schools in small districts, and was most often the case in middle school/junior high schools, especially those in small to medium-sized decentralized districts. In high schools, the leadership attributes of the principal were identified by interviewees, but the association between the SIPD projects and the role of the principal was not always clear. This is due to the size and organizational complexity of high schools, specifically the fact that at the time of the interviews SIPD projects had not yet covered the landscapes of most high schools, i.e., not all interviewees were intimately aware of all facets of their school's SIPD project and the role of the principal vis-a-vis the project.

In closing, last year and again this year, an interesting paradox surfaced during the course of interviewing faculty members and administrators about the role of their principal. Faculty members, as noted in a previous discussion, viewed their principals as educational leaders and attributed the school climate, among other things, to the leadership abilities of the principal. Principals, on the other hand, viewed themselves more as managers than as pedagogical leaders and ascribed the same school attributes to their ability to manage their schools well. High school principals, in particular, described themselves as managers and, because of their school's size and organizational complexity, did not view themselves as instructional leaders. Their staffs did, however. The apparent contradiction may lie in one's interpretation of the role of the principal as a visionary. In the eyes of faculty members, the principal who had both foresight and the means to assist staff in achieving goals was a leader; in the eyes of principals, this same individual who had the wherewithal to guide his or her faculty on a school improvement course was a skilled manager of people and resources.

SIPD Project Leadership

The creation of site committees was a requirement of the legislation. Specifically, site committees were to establish new lines of communication between administrators and teachers, between professionals and nonprofessionals, and between the school staff and the community, and they were responsible for the initial conceptualization, design, and orchestration of their school's SIPD project. In schools with both new and continuation projects, as well as two of the nonfunded sites (one elementary and the middle school), site committees generally were comprised of individuals (e.g., faculty, community members, central office staff, school board members) who had been elected by faculty. In most schools, membership was for the entire school year, although in some cases, changes were made mid-year to allow more faculty the opportunity to participate. In continuation projects and the two nonfunded sites with active projects, approximately 50 percent of year one's site committee were re-elected for year two.

As discussed in the section on goal development and on assessment and evaluation activities, site committees in all types of projects at all levels have been instrumental in laying the important groundwork for their project's development. They were viewed, according to interviewees last

schoolwide decisions related to project development and implementation were, when feasible, reached by discussion and consensus. Principals in continuation sites encouraged teachers to participate in planning and policy making and continued to make that a school, not just a project, priority.

Although site committees were viewed most often as the catalyst for the project-related school improvement change process being undertaken in their school, it was the principal who was widely regarded as the key to school improvement. This was almost universally the case in elementary schools, particularly elementary schools in small districts, and was most often the case in middle school/junior high schools, especially those in small to medium-sized decentralized districts. In high schools, the leadership attributes of the principal were identified by interviewees, but the association between the SIPD projects and the role of the principal was not always clear. This is due to the size and organizational complexity of high schools, specifically the fact that at the time of the interviews SIPD projects had not yet covered the landscapes of most high schools, i.e., not all interviewees were intimately aware of all facets of their school's SIPD project and the role of the principal vis-a-vis the project.

In closing, last year and again this year, an interesting paradox surfaced during the course of interviewing faculty members and administrators about the role of their principal. Faculty members, as noted in a previous discussion, viewed their principals as educational leaders and attributed the school climate, among other things, to the leadership abilities of the principal. Principals, on the other hand, viewed themselves more as managers than as pedagogical leaders and ascribed the same school attributes to their ability to manage their schools well. High school principals, in particular, described themselves as managers and, because of their school's size and organizational complexity, did not view themselves as instructional leaders. Their staffs did, however. The apparent contradiction may lie in one's interpretation of the role of the principal as a visionary. In the eyes of faculty members, the principal who had both foresight and the means to assist staff in achieving goals was a leader; in the eyes of principals, this same individual who had the wherewithal to guide his or her faculty on a school improvement course was a skilled manager of people and resources.

SIPD Project Leadership

The creation of site committees was a requirement of the legislation. Specifically, site committees were to establish new lines of communication between administrators and teachers, between professionals and nonprofessionals, and between the school staff and the community, and they were responsible for the initial conceptualization, design, and orchestration of their school's SIPD project. In schools with both new and continuation projects, as well as two of the nonfunded sites (one elementary and the middle school), site committees generally were comprised of individuals (e.g., faculty, community members, central office staff, school board members) who had been elected by faculty. In most schools, membership was for the entire school year, although in some cases, changes were made mid-year to allow more faculty the opportunity to participate. In continuation projects and the two nonfunded sites with active projects, approximately 50 percent of year one's site committee were re-elected for year two.

As discussed in the section on goal development and on assessment and evaluation activities, site committees in all types of projects at all levels have been instrumental in laying the important groundwork for their project's development. They were viewed, according to interviewees last

year and again this year as the catalysts for change, as the individuals having a clear vision of how to orchestrate change and improve their school, and as the group responsible for keeping the project alive.

New projects. During a project's first year, regardless of level, this view has translated into more of a management responsibility which has included making project-related decisions, directing project activities, keeping lines of communication open, disseminating information, overseeing professional development activities, collecting and analyzing data, preparing reports, administering funds, developing and administering the mini-grant program, and maintaining a steady level of enthusiasm among faculty. In addition, site committee members had their regular teaching responsibilities. Not surprisingly, site committee members were exhausted at the time of interviews, but they did not feel downtrodden from having too many things to do. Rather, they were kept buoyant, because they knew they were instrumental in the major improvements taking place in their school. This feeling was enhanced further by colleagues' positive responses to the myriad activities they were involved in and by principals who reinforced the hard work of site committees by including them in more school level decisions. According to interviewees, as principals saw what site committees were capable of, more school level decisions were devolved to them. Both site and non-site committee members at all three levels in the six new schools shared similar views about the roles and responsibilities of SIPD project leadership in their schools.

Continuation and Nonfunded Projects. During a project's second year, regardless of level, the nature of the project in most schools had changed enough to warrant new roles and responsibilities for project leadership. (This was also true for the two nonfunded sites that were implementing projects.) As noted in an earlier discussion, the second year in the majority of sites was an implementation year in the sense that faculties were taking the knowledge and skills acquired from activities they participated in during year one and actually trying them on. For some schools this meant that structural changes in a school's organization or in the configuration of a school day were going to occur, for others it meant that a new curriculum or a new program was being implemented, and still for others it meant providing a different teaching arrangement for instructing students. Regardless of the nature of the project, the second year was perceived by both site and non-site committee members as different from year one and the differentness translated into some new roles and responsibilities for project leadership. Many management responsibilities from year one were still required of site committee members. Tasks such as directing project activities, disseminating information, overseeing professional development activities including the administration of mini-grant programs, gathering and analyzing data, and preparing reports came with the territory of being on a site committee. However, unlike year one, which was dedicated in large part to providing teachers with professional development opportunities, year two required site committee members to oversee their project's implementation. This meant getting people--namely colleagues--to put the project into place. Many site committee members were not familiar or comfortable with this role, nor were their non-site committee colleagues in having them assume this role. In the same way that fiscal management was uncharted territory to many site committee members last year, the management of people was a new experience for many site committee members this year. The different focus of attention during year two required a different set of behaviors for site committees.

This unfamiliar role--managing people involved in a change process--was not unique to a particular grade level or to how coherent a school improvement project was, or to the degree of

cohesiveness of the faculty. Some site committee members at all three levels in all kinds of projects in several sites expressed their discomfort and frustration with how to get their colleagues to implement the school's SIPD project. What site committee members wanted was assurance from colleagues that the project was being implemented as planned or intended and this translated into a supervisory role which they did not necessarily want to assume. In several instances, the site committee would look to the principal for assistance with this task. All principals interviewed commented that they felt this was a site committee responsibility and that the issue was related to the implementation of the school's site-based management system and thus needed to be addressed by the faculty. Although this position was not always perceived as helpful, this was not a case of subterfuge on the part of principals, either. Rather, it speaks to an unforeseen and thus unaddressed problem for schools that are moving from a traditional division of labor to a site-based management system. Enforcing the implementation of an SIPD project is perceived as outside the jurisdiction of site committees and unless faculties decide how they want to proceed with the implementation of their project, especially if the project requires schoolwide changes, it may be difficult or impossible for a site committee to enforce the change. This issue did not come up in conversations with faculty at each site; however, because it was raised across all kinds of second year projects at all levels it is likely that over time it will surface as an issue to be dealt with in all sites.

Despite the concerns raised by interviewees about the responsibility of site committees in the management of change, the majority of site committee members interviewed still savored their role. For many, it was an opportunity to work in a collaborative fashion with colleagues on a schoolwide project and to be involved in key decisions that affected their work lives and those of their colleagues. As site committees demonstrated their ability to make decisions, they generally were entrusted with greater responsibility and discretion. Although this has resulted in raising issues that will require resolution, it is still potentially quite important for the development of professional communities and the operation of a true site-based management system because the matters of which teachers exert greater influence--e.g., determining behavior codes, establishing the school curriculum, changing instructional practices, modifying the school day, shaping teacher development programs, and disciplining students--are matters that are usually settled outside of the classroom and the school, often at the discretion of administrative authorities. For site committee members, the net result of having greater involvement and influence in key decisions of this kind has been feeling more efficacious in their day-to-day work activities.

Collaboration in Schools and the Implementation of a Site-Based Management System

Management of School Improvement

One of the major features of HB 2020 was to change the extant decisional structure of school systems by decentralizing important educational choices that impact teachers' work to the school level. Using the context of school improvement projects as the vehicle for reform, the legislation sought to reorganize, not only schools, but school districts, by altering traditional territorial ranges of authority or control. Specifically, the locus of control over decisions concerning the management of school improvement was to shift from traditional lines of authority to the schools themselves.

In its structural details this approach to reform has endeavored to empower teachers by granting them greater individual control over their own jobs, as well as greater collective say in shaping the policies and practices related to their school's project.

As noted in an earlier discussion, schools competed for available SIPD resources through an application process that required them to demonstrate not only need but an ability to conceptualize school improvement. Specifically, they had to be able to describe how they intended to convert the monetary resources into other important resources such as personnel, materials, and information to reach project goals. According to interviewees, discussions at the application stage took place in the schools and were conducted by faculty members who crossed occupational lines to work together on important issues related to the orchestration and implementation of their projects. This process became the undergirding for the restructuring of the workplace; it set the stage for change in the authority structure of schools.

By the time SIPD grants were awarded, faculty members had already had some experience in coming together and negotiating specific features of their school improvement projects. This was particularly true for schools with continuation projects where individuals had been working together on their school's project for over a year. The governance structure, at least as far as school improvement was concerned, had begun to shift. Not surprisingly, when faculty members in SIPD schools with new and continuation projects were asked if the locus of control over the management of school improvement had changed from what had existed prior to implementation of HB 2020 to the present time, they indicated that influence over a variety of aspects related to the management of school improvement had indeed changed. Whereas school improvement decisions had been predominantly the jurisdiction of school and district administrators only prior to HB 2020, they are now predominantly the province of teachers and school administrators.

In many schools with continuation projects the shift toward even greater teacher control is evident. This has been especially true in several large comprehensive high schools where a movement is underway to restructure the school day and, in some cases, the configuration of departments, and to establish a statewide network for high schools interested in this type of reform effort. In these schools teachers noted that having control over these kinds of decisions is paramount to the effective implementation of a site-based management system. Schoolwide teacher-instigated programmatic changes have also occurred in several elementary and middle schools with continuation projects and, although less visible than the major structural reform efforts being undertaken in some high schools, the changes have been pervasive in the sense that everyone in the school is involved in implementing the program. Importantly, teachers have been instrumental in these schools in orchestrating the implementation of the school's school improvement project.

This major change in the authority structure of schools--from control over school improvement decisions being dominated by administrators to control being shared by teachers and administrators--was identified by teachers and administrators during interviews as the single largest change that had taken place in their schools. Although teachers and school administrators in most schools had worked collaboratively on a variety of school issues, most of the interviewees, had not ever recalled working collaboratively on a major schoolwide program before and attributed this change in modus operandi to the legislation. Resource acquisition and being able to manage the resources were key factors in this shift of control. According to interviewees in schools with both new and continuation projects, their discussions took on a different meaning when resources were made available and decisions about allocation were

within their control. They also felt that their level of commitment toward reaching their goals had increased because they were in control of important decisions. In sum, being able to conceptualize a school improvement program and implement their decisions from start to finish increased educators' sense of efficacy and professionalism.

Collaboration in Schools

The preceding discussion highlighted the major effect of HB 2020 in SIPD schools with both new and continuation projects. Targeted at changing the decision structure of schools systems, the legislation focused on decentralizing important decisions concerning school improvement and provided resources for schools to work on all stages of project development. This has translated into teachers gaining control over decisions that impact their work. In continuation sites, as projects have matured and teachers have assumed more responsibility from year one to year two, they have been granted more autonomy in the performance of their jobs, greater say in the running of their own schools, and more influence in educational policy making and administration.

For both new and continuation projects the collaborative relationships formed at the initial stages of project development have endured over time and have in, many schools, resulted in the formation of a community of professionals (or in multiple professional communities) where educational values are widely shared. In some schools, teachers associated with the same school for many years but isolated because of teaching assignment now know what other teachers in the school are doing. (This has been particularly true in large middle/junior high schools and high schools.) Schoolwide decisions are now often reached by discussion and consensus. As noted in an earlier discussion, principals are now encouraging teachers to participate in collaborative planning and policy making outside of the classroom. According to interviewees, they are also more likely to respect the professional knowledge, skills, and judgement of teachers and to grant them ample latitude to run their classrooms. Although the nature and extent of teacher autonomy is, according to principals, predicated on the amount of autonomy a school has, there has been an increase in teacher collaboration and influence and in staff harmony in schools with both new and continuation projects.

In sum, in terms of the extensiveness of the collaboration among faculty members on a broad range of decision issues, it was clear during discussions with faculty in both kinds of projects that greater collaboration between teachers and administrators and among teachers crossing occupational lines had occurred around the issues of implementing and managing school improvement activities as a result of the legislation. In addition, a majority of interviewees in both kinds of projects indicated that subsequent to the implementation of HB 2020, they were working in groups on a variety of school issues. A change in practices had taken on a life beyond the scope of the specific school improvement project. Collaboration among faculty members established early in the application process had extended into other work domains. For many, this was a change from practices that had existed prior to HB 2020. For nonfunded sites, collaborative work practices appear to be related to principal and site committee motivation in this area. Two of the schools (one elementary and the middle school) are implementing their projects and teachers are working collaboratively on project implementation and, according to interviewees, in other areas as well.

These findings are important, because they suggest that broad-based structural change predicated on a new set of beliefs about occupational governance is not only a viable but an appropriate expectation to hold when considering major organizational change and renewal. Since occupational life is shaped by specific contexts of work, when belief systems about work relationships change, a change in practices follows. However the process of changing (a group's) values and beliefs is slow and not uniform across organizations; that is, it is not the same for all types of schools.

High schools, especially large comprehensive high schools, are comprised of diverse disciplinary communities with relatively unique work cultures consisting of, among other things, task rituals, standards for proper and improper behavior, and work codes which surround relatively routine practices. Collaboration among high school teachers usually occurs within disciplinary communities, not across. Hence attempts at imposing schoolwide structural change at the high school level require working first within occupational communities. High school teachers' work cultures are so tied to basic tenets of the discipline that discussions concerning innovation usually center on the discipline; teachers are receptive to change if they can see its application to the curriculum. Pedagogy is seen as the vehicle for implementing curriculum; it, too, is intricately woven to (often institutionalized) disciplinary practices. A change in beliefs about the advantages of cross-disciplinary collaboration is thus a slow process. This artifact of high schools is not as prominent at the other two levels of the school organization.

Elementary schools represent a much more homogeneous work culture, although differences abound in work style and organization of classrooms. Collaboration among faculty members at the elementary level is likely the modus operandi at most schools. Unless faculties are quite large, discussions among teachers and administrators about change occur regularly and according to teachers interviewed, a change in practices usually is not resisted unless teachers are being asked to do more than they feel is reasonable. Similarity in training enhances their ability to work together on a variety of issues. According to interviewees, middle schools and junior high schools have been involved in a restructuring process for the last 5-10 years and are setting themselves apart from both elementary and high schools by adopting a new philosophy for working with this adolescent age group. As a result, many middle school faculties have had some say (and practice) in the design of their program. Collaboration has been ongoing and it has been interactive in the sense that dialogue has often involved more than one school level (e.g., elementary and middle school).

In conclusion, collaboration on issues broader than school improvement projects is taking place and is, according to faculty members in both new and continuation sites, attributable to practices set in place by the requirements of the legislation and for schools with continuation projects from experience in working collaboratively on a variety of school issues. However, the well-institutionalized norms, values, and beliefs held by different occupational communities necessitates that change be conducted differently and that expectations for changes in practices and processes be consistent with the way schools operate. Change via a collaborative work structure in elementary schools is a qualitatively different process than that which occurs in high schools and junior high/middle schools.

Decision-Making Opportunities

In addition to a change in the working relationships of faculty members resulting from the implementation of HB 2020, there is evidence that decision-making opportunities at the school level have increased as the result of the legislation. This change is an expected outgrowth of the restructuring of the workplace in that changes in the decision structure of schools result in faculty members having greater opportunities for making decisions that affect their work. While collaboration refers to people working together in a joint effort of one kind or another, one cannot automatically assume that an outcome of collaboration will be an increase in influence over decisions. Collaboration may enhance a group's ability to marshall support to effect a decision--especially if there is consensus among group members on the issue at hand--but it is not equal to influence in decision making. Hence it becomes important to know if faculty members perceive that, as a result of the restructuring of the workplace, they have also gained authority to make decisions that affect their work. Evidence for this will then suggest that changes in the authority structure at the school level have produced an environment that fosters occupational governance. Having opportunity to collaborate and influence decisions on matters that are considered important and critical to one's work are evidence of movement toward occupational self-control and of the operation of an effective site-based management system.

As noted in an earlier discussion, when interviewees were asked if prior to HB 2020 teachers had enough opportunity to influence decisions that affected their work most answered that, although their principal had been interested in, supportive of, and had encouraged participatory decision making before their SIPD grant, the decision domains available to influence were generally those concerned with their classroom (e.g., choosing instructional methods, grouping students within the classroom, etc.). Opportunities for teachers to influence other types of decisions were limited and dependent on a host of exogenous variable. However, with the implementation of HB 2020 came a change in the workplace. There was an increase in the nature and in the extent of collaboration among teachers and among teachers and administrators. Beginning with decisions about school improvement issues, decision opportunities spread to other domains salient to the work lives of teachers. The scope of decision opportunities has become larger as projects have matured and individuals have taken on and have been entrusted with more responsibilities. Indeed, decision domains that were once the province of administrators have now, in some schools, been devolved to teachers. However, similar to last year's findings, decision opportunities are not the same for all schools or for all people in schools. Organizational size, school level, staff position, membership on a school's site committee, and whether a school is implementing a new or continuation project mitigate decision opportunities for faculty members. As well, characteristics of the institutional environment discussed in the section, "The Elements of School Leadership," have also been found to influence decision opportunities for teachers. Because year of project cuts across the organizational dimensions of district size, school level, site committee membership, and staff position, differences between year one and year two projects, where they exist, will be treated within each of the four discussions.

District size. During interviews with staff in schools with both new and continuation projects, more faculty members in small districts said they had enough opportunity to influence decisions than did faculty members in very large districts. Teachers working in small districts indicated that they had a relatively easy time influencing decisions, because there was virtually no hierarchical chain of command that had to be followed or consulted. Emancipated from bureaucratic control, they felt they were in charge and autonomous in most decisions affecting their work. Interviews with administrators in the small districts confirmed teacher's perceptions. By way of contrast, teachers in very large districts felt constrained in their decision making efforts, because district

protocol required that they confer with individuals at several levels before a final decision could be made. Teachers identified school policy as an area in particular that required a final decision to be made by district administrators. Being able to determine grading policies, attendance policies, staffing, and scheduling (e.g., determining length of school day) were cited as examples of policy decisions that teachers felt constrained to make. This was true for personnel in all schools in a large district. A large district with a decentralized decision structure did appear, however, to offer a modicum of decision latitude not present in more centralized districts. Although there were district level policies developed and enforced by district administrators in both kinds of districts, teachers and administrators in the large decentralized districts felt slightly more in control of what went on in their school than did teachers and administrators in large centralized districts.

As an example of how this occurs, one of the large high schools with a continuation project is located in a very large district that is becoming decentralized through a major districtwide restructuring effort. With the reorganization into five district areas, each area will have authority and discretion over its own budget. As a result of this redistribution of authority and money, the school expects to gain greater control over decisions affecting the operation of the school (e.g., allocation of resources, etc.). Indeed, at the time of the site visit, interviewees expressed hope that the reorganization would result in their having more autonomy at the school level to make decisions that are tailored to the needs and interests of students in their school. The implementation of part of their school improvement project is an example of a move in this direction. The school is in the process of reorganizing the school day one day a week to allow teachers time to meet for collegial sharing and cross-curricular planning.

A district's size is also associated with demographic characteristics that have been noted to affect the nature and extent of decision opportunities available in schools. Specifically, the larger environment in which a school operates influences the amount of a school's autonomy from district constraints. The homogeneity of the community and the absence of serious problems, in particular, appear to enhance a school's ability to be more autonomous. These demographic characteristics are most often associated with suburban and rural areas, not large urban areas where very large school districts are located.

District size and location tend to mitigate the effects of a school being in the first or second year of its project in the sense that, while faculty in schools with continuation projects tend to have a broader range of decision areas available to them by virtue of both their demonstrated success in project activities and the expanded scope of projects during year two than faculty in schools with new projects, the nature and extent of the decision areas available seem to be strongly influenced by the interdependent relationship among the demographic characteristics of the school and district and the mix of the people in the school. Consequently, because a district's demographic characteristics have been found to influence a school's opportunities to influence decisions in both new and continuation projects, it is difficult to unravel the separate effects of year of project on decision opportunities. The mix of variables that are bound together likely interact in a way that results in an increase in the amount of decision opportunities available to faculty.

School level. A school's level also appears to be related to opportunity to influence decisions. This is true for schools with both new and continuation projects. Elementary schools are comprised of a more homogeneous faculty than either middle schools/junior high schools or secondary schools. As an occupational community, elementary teachers have more similar educational backgrounds and share similar beliefs and values about the way their school is to operate. Elementary teachers generally have a classroom of students for an entire year and are

responsible for making and enforcing policy decisions that affect classroom life (e.g., discipline, grading). Elementary school faculties have been likened to a large family, and the appropriateness of this metaphor was reinforced during interviews when teachers used the pronoun "we" to describe how decisions were made and who was involved. Elementary principals tended to work with their faculties to make school level decisions together.

This practice was less likely to occur in middle schools/junior high schools and secondary schools for reasons of size, complexity, and diversity among faculty. Middle schools/junior high schools and secondary schools are, most of the time, structurally differentiated in the sense that teachers are trained as subject matter specialists and classes generally are organized around specific subject matter. Diverse occupational communities comprised of individuals with different backgrounds, beliefs, values, and work norms have difficulty coming together and making schoolwide decisions.

School size mitigates the amount of decision opportunity available to teachers at all levels. Regardless of type of project, faculty in smaller schools tended to have more opportunity to influence decisions. Having fewer teachers usually translated into having to assume more responsibilities to carry out the day-to-day activities in the school. Greater responsibility meant more authority to make decisions. This was true in schools at all levels, and was particularly the case in small to medium-size elementary schools in small districts.

Site Committee Membership. Opportunities for decision influence and change in nature and extent of decision influence as a result of HB 2020 were also found to be different for site committee members and non-site committee members in schools with both new and continuation projects. Site committees are the groups of individuals in each school who in effect manage their schools' SIPD projects. Site committee members are responsible for, among other things, the fiscal management of SIPD funds, the implementation of project goals, and they have decision making power over various parts of their projects.

As a governing body, site committees are in a propitious position to effect change at the school level. They have been selected by their peers and thus have, for the most part, the trust and confidence of these individuals when it comes to making decisions. In schools visited with new projects, site committee members made a lot of the initial or primary decisions concerning their school's SIPD project. This was particularly the case for determining professional development activities. Goal development was orchestrated by site committee members at the application stage. Implementation of SIPD projects and evaluation of goal attainment were also organized by site committee members. Faculty members were involved in the decisions, but were not often instrumental in the early stages of the decision process. Staff seemed content and satisfied with the role that site committee members had assumed; they were not perceived as autocratic.

In schools with continuation projects, site committees were quite actively involved in the implementation of their school's project and thus were in positions requiring decision making about a host of new issues. Opportunities expanded as the scope of the project enlarged. This was also true for most non-site committee members interviewed, who noted during discussions about decision making opportunities that the nature of their project during year two provided more opportunity for everyone to be involved and influential in decisions concerning their project. Although several non-site committee members indicated that they preferred to not be a part of their project and any decisions related to it, they also acknowledged that should they choose to be involved, they could be. Both site and non-site committee members in many continuation

projects also noted that faculty were being entrusted with more decision opportunities outside the domain of their 2020 project this year than last and attributed this to their having been successful in decision making efforts related to project activities during year one. Demonstrating competence has resulted in increased opportunity.

Staff Position. Differences in perceptions about decision influence were also found to be related to school position. Similar to what was found last year, a larger percentage of administrators than teachers felt that teachers have enough opportunity to influence decisions. This was true in schools with both new and continuation projects, but was heard most often in schools with new projects. Moreover, despite the fact that principals in schools with continuation projects are providing teachers with more opportunities for decision making, differences in perceptions about the exact nature of the opportunity surfaced during interviews. The likely origin of these differences in perception is confusion about the difference between decision involvement and decision influence that arose during interviews. Principals referred to teacher involvement on various committees when they spoke of how teachers were able to influence decisions. Teachers, however, commented that they may be involved in decision making but not necessarily influential in the outcome.

When the finding is considered in the context of HB 2020 and the restructuring of the workplace, it takes on special importance, because it speaks to individuals working together with widely differing perceptions of what is considered enough decision influence for teachers. This issue is central to the success of a site-based management program and likely holds the key for ensuring teachers' occupational self-governance. Differences in perception about what constitutes enough opportunity for teachers to influence decisions are an example of role conflict between teachers and administrators that is the result of incongruent expectations about the role of teachers. Teacher's and administrator's definitions of a situation are going to be different if perceptions about roles are incompatible. Role conflict has the potential for undermining the success of a site-based management program, because differences here reflect dissension in beliefs among administrators and teachers about the nature and extent of occupational control teachers should have over critical work-related decisions.

Summary of Decision-Making Opportunities. In conclusion, opportunities for teachers to influence decisions that affect their work have increased as a result of HB 2020, particularly in areas integral to the implementation of SIPD projects. For faculty in schools with continuation projects, opportunities have enlarged as the scope of the project has expanded and as teachers have been able to demonstrate their capabilities as decision makers. In many cases, this has included opportunities for decision-making in areas outside the general parameters of the project. For some faculty members however, opportunity has been greater than for others; when differences occur, they are related to certain features of the school organization. Specifically, district size, school level, site committee membership, and school position were found to be related to differences in perceived decision opportunities for teachers. However, characteristics of the school's institutional environment mitigate the effects of these variables in a way that makes it difficult to isolate precisely what influences have the strongest bearing on decision-making opportunities in schools.

Nevertheless, the fact that certain organizational characteristics may temper the effects of HB2020 is important for understanding the kinds of expectations one can have regarding the implementation of school improvement projects, especially projects that are intended to alter extant decision structures. Schools as implementing organizations are established social

systems with already patterned behaviors. Consequently, change in social structures and behavior is not going to be uniform across school organizations, nor is the process of change going to be the same for all types of schools. Indeed, what was found during site visits was that change is intricately tied to a school's larger institutional setting. What happens is that the legislation affects implementation by interacting with organizational characteristics to produce different situational constraints and opportunities for faculty members. This was especially true in the case of decision-making opportunities for teachers where the interactive effects of legislation and school context had bearing on the amount of opportunity teachers have to influence decisions that affect their work.

As a final note, opportunities for teachers to influence decisions in schools with nonfunded projects are related to the same mix of variables as are found in schools with funded projects with two additionally essential ingredients: the principal and the site committee. Strong school and project leadership have been important for funded projects and are, according to interviewees, critical for the survival and sustenance of nonfunded projects. This is particularly true for decision opportunities associated with project development and implementation. Beyond project-related activities, decision opportunities are school, teacher, and situation specific. Principals play a key role in providing opportunities for teachers and are credited with being instrumental in making opportunities happen for their staff.

Decision-Making Involvement and Influence

The topic of decision-making involvement and influence has been central to most discussions concerning reform in the workplace. Although the two words--involvement and influence--often are connoted as having the same intent in the workplace, the terms translate into quite difference in schools.

Involvement in decision-making means to be merely included in the decision-making process with limited ability to affect, regulate or control the actual outcome of events. For example, involvement is a type of participation that may take the form of being asked an opinion, or voting on the selection of a single textbook from a small list of choices, or making a recommendation for a new faculty member, or discussing items on a faculty agenda.

Influence in decision-making means to have appreciably greater control over the decision process, to have the ability to bring about outcomes one feels are important and essential. For example, a person with influence solicits the opinion of others by asking specific questions, or identifies the list of textbooks to be voted on by others, or reviews and develops criteria for evaluating applications for a new faculty position, or determines which potential items for the faculty agenda will actually be included on the agenda.

Decision-making opportunities in schools may or may not translate in practice into teachers feeling that they can, if they choose, influence important aspects of their work lives. Traditionally, decision-making arenas open to teachers have centered on those curriculum and instruction activities that are salient to classroom life. For teachers at all levels this generally has included having influence over instructional methods, curriculum materials, classroom grouping strategies, grading practices, and classroom assessment activities. However, the amount of latitude teachers have had in these decision domains has been related to the nature and extent of district and school policies in these areas. The degree of policymaking, as noted in an earlier

discussion, varies by district and school and is often the result of pressures to address educational symptoms (e.g., drugs, violence, absenteeism) of problems in the larger environment in which schools operate (e.g., economic hardship, broken families). Hence, the amount of school-level decision-making involvement and influence available to teachers can be constrained by conditions outside the control of school faculty.

Notwithstanding the powerful influence of the institutional environment, a major thrust of the movement toward greater teacher professionalism in the workplace (i.e., site-based management) has been to empower teachers by granting them greater control over their own jobs, as well as collective say in shaping the policies and practices of their schools. Indeed, one of them major thrusts of HB 2020 was to have faculty actively share in the educational planning and decision making of the school. However, for this goal to be achieved required the reallocation of power from districts to schools and from administrators to teachers. Achievement of this kind breeds expectation. Hence, in 2020 schools the expected effect of this movement toward site-based management was a change in the locus of control over key decision domains that affect the work lives of teachers. This was to translate into influence over decisions that extended beyond the classroom door. Has this occurred?

Interviewees in all schools visited were provided with definitions of decision-making involvement and influence (see definitions at beginning of this section) and were asked: 1) what decision areas teachers were most and least influential and involved in, 2) whether the areas teachers were most influential and involved in had increased since the beginning of their SIPD project and if so, in what areas, 3) whether they wished they had more influence in school matters and if so, in what areas, and 4) what constraints precluded their having greater influence. Responses were tabulated and grouped into the four decision domains identified in last year's SIPD evaluation: 1) personnel decisions (e.g., staffing, determining own teaching assignment), 2) school budget and policy decisions (e.g., policies in attendance, discipline, assessment, grading, resource allocation), 3) curriculum and instruction decisions (e.g., selecting textbooks, determining curriculum, selecting teaching strategies), and 4) staff development/school improvement decisions (e.g., selecting professional development activities, developing school improvement program). An additional decision domain called "2020 Project activities" surfaced this year and is being kept separate from the other decision domains, because respondents in several schools referred specifically to their projects to illustrate the decision areas where they have become most influential and involved since being awarded their SIPD grant.

Table 4 presents the responses of interviewees by type of project and school level.

Table 4

Teacher Influence and Involvement in Decision Making

	Decision Area(s) With Most Infl. & Inv.	Decision Area(s) With Least Influ. & Inv.	Decision Area(s), With Most Infl. & Inv. Since HB 2020	Decision Area(s) Wish More Influ. & Inv.
CONTINUATION PROJECTS				
Elementary	Curriculum & Instruction 2020 Project Activities	School Budget & Policy	2020 Project Activities	School Budget & Policy
Middle/ Junior H.S.	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	Staff Development/ School Improvement	School Budget & Policy
High School	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy Personnel	School Budget & Policy	School Budget, & Policy, Personnel
NEW PROJECTS				
Elementary	Curriculum & Instruction	Curriculum & Instruction Personnel, Budget & Policy	Curriculum & Instruction	None Identified
Middle/ Junior H.S.	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	Staff Development/ School Improvement, School Budget & Policy	School Budget & Policy
High School	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	Staff Development/ School Improvement	School Budget & Policy Curriculum & Instruction
NONFUNDED PROJECTS				
Elementary	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy Curriculum & Instruction	2020 Project Activities	School Budget & Policy Curriculum & Instruction
Middle/ Junior H.S.	School Budget & Policy Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy
High School	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	2020 Project Activities	School Budget & Policy

Of the five decision domains, decisions around curriculum and instruction activities are the areas in which the majority of teachers in all types of projects and across all grade levels feel they are most influential and involved. This is not surprising given that many of these kinds of decisions are classroom-related decisions and are central to the work lives of teachers.

The decision domain where teachers feel least influential and involved and, not surprisingly, where they wish to have more influence and involvement is in the areas of school budget and policy making. Although teachers in high schools with continuation projects and middle/junior high schools with new projects indicated that they have gained influence and greater involvement over these areas since the beginning of their SIPD project, it is still difficult for most teachers to make progress in this area. The constraints of school and district administration surfaced most often in discussions with teachers about areas where they feel the least influential and involved. This is not surprising given the congeries of influence in a school's regulatory environment that pose constraints and contingencies on how schools are to operate. Influence from the school's regulatory environment and central office preclude teachers from being more influential in the workplace, hence teacher's perceptions that they do not have much involvement and influence in many school-related decisions.

Of particular interest are the decision areas identified by interviewees where there has been the most progress since the inception of their SIPD project. Interviewees indicated that they have been most influential and involved in decisions concerning all aspects of their 2020 projects, those relating specifically to staff development, and to those pertaining to curriculum and instruction activities. Given the focus of HB 2020, this finding about 2020 project activities is to be expected. However, the fact that interviewees in middle/junior high schools with new projects and in high schools with continuation projects identified decision domains beyond the specific parameters of their 2020 projects is especially noteworthy, because it says that teacher empowerment in the workplace is expanding to include other areas critical to the teachers' work lives. The increase in decision opportunities noted in an earlier discussion has resulted in an increase in teachers' decision-making influence and involvement. Teachers are experiencing greater control over decision areas, particularly those pertaining to budget and policy, that impact what they do in schools. However, as clearly shown in Table 4, what they have gained is still not enough. The wish for greater influence over policies that affect their work lives was expressed in the majority of interviews with teachers in all types of projects. The litany of constraints identified by interviewees earlier was also voiced by interviewees during these discussions. Unfortunately, many schools are located in environments that may preclude teachers from gaining more control over policies that impact the operation of their school. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight the progress that has been attained by schools with projects.

These findings are important because the nature and extent of control teachers feel they have over their world of work, vis-a-vis what they would like to have, is at the heart of implementing a successful school-based management program. For a school-based management program to have more than symbolic meaning for teachers requires that teachers gain a greater share of authority to make decisions regarding their work and feel that their desired level of decision involvement and/or influence in matters that are important for them is not discrepant from what they feel they actually have.

Professional Growth and Development

Overview

A major intent of HB 2020 is to make professional development opportunities related to a school's SIPD project available to all faculty. Professional development activities became a major part of each project's initial conceptualization and were viewed as a critical component to the achievement of a school's SIPD goals. For schools with new projects, professional development activities generally played a prominent role in the developmental stages of the school's project; in schools with continuation projects where attention was focused on the implementation of the project, professional development activities played a more secondary role, especially in schools that had elected to extend their project over a two-year period. In schools with nonfunded projects, the opportunity to participate in professional development activities was contingent on the availability of resources. Professional development activities in all types of projects consisted of individual activities, group activities, and mini-grant activities. These categories were not entirely separate and often were mutually supportive. Types of professional development activities included workshops, university and college courses, seminars, research projects, visitations to other schools and programs, conferences, teacher presentations, and staff retreats. Depending on the nature of a school's project, professional development activities were provided to individuals and/or an entire school. Faculty members in the 24 schools visited were queried about the nature and extent of professional development activities in their schools. In particular, they were asked about teacher influence and involvement in decisions about professional development activities and the effects of professional development activities on their own professional growth and on the realization of their school's SIPD project goals.

Teacher Influence and Involvement in Decisions About Professional Development Activities

One of the most consistent findings across all types of projects was that professional growth and career opportunities were an integral part of every SIPD project and control over these kinds of decisions rested with site committees and often the entire faculty at a school.

During interviews, faculty members were asked about changes in decision-making opportunities since the implementation of HB 2020, and nearly all individuals concurred that opportunities had increased, particularly in areas related to their SIPD project. Specifically, interviewees identified professional development activities as the area where they had the greatest amount of decision influence. Given that the majority of SIPD resources were allocated to this area, it is not surprising that teachers felt they had influence in deciding how money was to be spent on staff development.

For teachers, professional development activities are their life-blood; the activities are capable of recharging when motivation plummets, and they often provide the inspiration to persevere in the face of adversity. Hence, their importance for teachers as a decision domain cannot be understated. Interviewees overwhelmingly cited the ability to make decisions in this area as central to their identities as professionals. This expression of satisfaction was related, in their minds, with the amount of control they felt they now had in determining how professional development resources were to be allocated. Teachers, in particular, noted that being able to

decide how to enhance their roles as an educator was an important source of power and control over their work. For most interviewees, prior to HB 2020, authority over this important decision domain had been out of their hands. Not surprisingly, change in this area has had significant consequences for teachers; however, as a matter of importance, the change is related directly to the larger issue of school finance.

The economic environment in which a great many of the SIPD schools operate has been, according to interviewees, stable but poor. Many of the schools visited are in the safety net. Financial instability has translated into a retrenching of funding in certain educational areas. Most notable for teachers among the areas cut has been staff development. Over time, as staff development funds have been curtailed and earmarked for other educational areas, districts have responded to staff development needs by providing only districtwide activities. This common denominator approach has resulted in teachers feeling that their professional growth needs are not being satisfied. For many, the inservice activities made available by the district simply did not make a difference to them professionally; that is, either they were not tailored to the specific needs of the audience (an impossible task when the audience is all the teachers in a district) or they did not enhance teachers professional development as educators (also an impossible task when an audience is so diverse in background). Consequently, according to interviewees, teachers often passively resisted their district's attempts to provide meaningful staff development activities by attending but not actively participating. This practice changed with the implementation of HB 2020.

According to interviewees, for the first time in most of their professional lives they had control over decisions about how best to enhance their role as educators. Without question, the ability to decide how to allocate resources--lots of resources--to this area changed the lives of teachers more than any other aspect of the legislation. Teachers became effusive when they described the activities they had chosen for their school and for themselves. For the majority of SIPD schools, professional development training in particular areas was the vehicle for reaching specific project goals. For example, in several schools project activities were focused on increasing students' self-esteem, in particular, those students who were considered at-risk of leaving school. This was achieved initially by providing teachers with inservice training in becoming sensitized to the needs of this population and in different teaching and behavioral approaches to use with at-risk students to increase their success in school. During the second year, some sites were implementing schoolwide programs developed specifically for this student population. The fact that faculty members decided both on the actual goal and how to reach the goal through specific project activities made teachers feel that they were in charge of their professional lives. And in schools that opted to include mini-grants as part of their SIPD project, teachers were able to select activities that were unique to their grant's goals. The amount of latitude teachers had in selecting professional development activities was infinite in the sense that control over the decisions rested with them. The only requirement was that professional development activities had to relate to the school's SIPD project. Because project goals had been decided on by the faculty through a comprehensive needs assessment, this restriction did not pose any problem for the majority of individuals interviewed. Indeed, according to many interviewees, this practice--identifying needs through an assessment, relating activities to project goals, and providing a variety of activities to meet or satisfy the goals--is different from the way their districts have operated in the past with respect to determining and providing staff development opportunities.

Effects of Professional Development Activities

The impact of resource allocation on professional development opportunities has been felt by almost everyone in each of the schools visited. Interviewees in all the schools visited were able to carry on conversations about their schools professional development activities and the benefits they had derived from participating in workshops and attending conferences, suggesting that this particular feature of the legislation had reached nearly everyone in each of the schools. According to teachers at all levels, the professional development activities that provided new information and knowledge about teaching strategies, a new language for teachers to communicate with one another, and that encouraged teacher interaction and dialogue about the newly acquired learning were the most helpful and the most utilized. The ability of the trainer to concretize concepts (e.g., how to use cooperative learning in American Literature classes) also enabled teachers to immediately apply what they had learned. This was particularly true for high school teachers. Hence, regardless of a school's specific project goals, professional development activities that could be readily transported into the classroom were, according to interviewees at all levels, the most appreciated. Teachers in SIPD schools where attaining project goals required learning a new language were also in the propitious position to then be able to communicate across grade levels or subject areas. For example, an elementary school with a nonfunded project had as one of its goals during year one "writing across the curriculum" and had hired two consultants to provide training in this area. During interviews with faculty members at this school last year, individuals emphasized how primary teachers were now able to talk with intermediate teachers about designing a writing curriculum that included a progression of skills to be taught at each grade in different subject areas and how to assess students writing ability on an ongoing basis. A first grade teacher referred to a discussion she had had with a fifth grade teacher about implementing a writing project and noted that this kind of conversation would not and could not have been possible without the training the faculty had received. This year the school's 2020 goal dovetailed with a district goal to train teachers in how to teach thinking and writing. Teachers' ability to acquire new knowledge and learn new instructional strategies was enhanced because they spoke a common language and had worked together on the project last year. According to a site committee member, although the lack of funding has resulted in the faculty going at a slower pace, the skills teachers had learned last year have enabled them "to discuss within and across grade levels how writing traits will be taught and how to connect thinking and writing in the assessment process." In this school, district staff development funds are being used to train teachers in the district. "Whole faculty professional development training" in an area was more common in elementary schools and often resulted in elementary teachers speaking the same language. This enhanced their opportunity to work together on a wide variety of school issues, not just those related to specific project goals.

The example of the nonfunded site is an illustration of how staff development activities can enhance not only one's professional growth, but the implementation of a project as well. How a school conceptualizes and utilizes staff development training during its first year has bearing on the ease with which a project is implemented its second year. The extent to which a school has an overarching and coherent school improvement program facilitates this process. Individual professional development activities can improve one's skills in the classroom and increase one's confidence about trying new instructional approaches with students, according to interviewees at all grade levels in all types of projects. And, often, if enough people receive the same training, the benefits extend beyond a single classroom or a department. However, professional development training that involves everyone and that is integrally related to a school's school

improvement program has the greatest impact schoolwide, especially professional development training that is tied to goals that promote academic excellence. In schools where this has occurred it is possible to see the effects of this important part of HB 2020 on a school. Here, the total effect on a school is greater than the sum of its parts.

As a final note, an unanticipated effect of professional development activities on teachers in several SIPD schools has been the expertise and skills they have acquired as trainers. Many teachers have utilized the training they have received in certain areas to train teachers in their own school and in the case of the nonfunded junior high school, teachers have been involved in training teachers in other schools. In the truest sense of the word, then, there has been professional development. As teachers became proficient with specialized instruction and practice they took their newly acquired knowledge and expertise and did what they do best: taught others what they had learned. The intrinsic reward from these experiences has enhanced teachers' self-esteem and at the nonfunded junior high school has had the added benefit of motivating site committee members to keep their project alive. What is most important here, from the standpoint of empowerment, is that veteran teachers have taken on a portion of one of the most vital functions in a school: the continuing professional education of fellow teachers. And they didn't have to give up teaching and become administrators to do it.

Differences in Professional Development By Type of Project and School Level

Type of Project

Stage of project development and resource allocation played a critical role in the nature and extent of professional development activities being provided in each of the 24 schools visited. Generally, the newer the project and the shorter the time frame for the project, the greater the number of professional development activities offered in a school. This was true for schools at all levels.

Schools with new projects that had decided to work on their project during one school year used most of their resources for staff development activities. According to interviewees, faculty were engaged and involved in myriad activities related to the attainment of their project goals. For many schools, the infusion of so much money into this area resulted in teachers being able to attend as many conferences, workshops, and the like as they wished and for which there was time. In addition to school-level professional development activities, mini-grants were also available in some of these schools. For new (and continuation) projects where the school had elected to extend the project over a two-year period, the whirl of professional development activity present in schools conducting project activities in one year looked, by comparison, like people moving in a film being shown in slow motion. Because funding was spread over a two-year period, resources allocated for professional development activities were literally cut-in-half. The number of activities available was reduced and the criteria for granting resources to individuals was more restrictive. Having less money required site committees to be more prudent in the selection criteria they developed for making decisions.

Schools with continuation projects operated very differently with respect to professional development activities offered this year than they had during year one, and this rankled interviewees in many of the schools visited. The abundance (in number and in kind) of

professional development activities available to faculty last year was not available this year for two reasons. First, schools that elected to extend their project over a two-year period were faced with reducing their grant by half, which resulted in fewer total dollars being available in each of the two years. Second, year two was, as discussed in prior sections, the implementation year, and the nature of the activities offered was related directly to this end. The combination of these translated into fewer and more restricted choices. Feeling flush had given way to feeling penurious, a state several interviewees equated with "how things were prior to HB 2020." Although this was not the case, it speaks to what can happen when a school that was poor receives a lot of money and most of it is directed toward increasing the professional development of teachers. In many of the schools visited teachers have felt starved for professional development opportunities and their SIPD grant kept them sated for a school year. This year has been different, and in many respects, what is happening this year is more realistic in terms of teachers' time and relating professional development activities directly to implementing a project. Where there has been latitude, it has been in the area of mini-grants. In schools with mini-grants, teachers still have opportunity to pursue a special interest. As a final note, several schools with continuation projects are using faculty members to provide inservice training to staff. This type of staff development effort is different from how most schools received training during year one.

The schools with nonfunded projects had varying degrees of professional development activities, ranging from none being available in two of the schools (one elementary and the middle school) to some being offered in two of the schools (one elementary and the high school). In both the elementary school and high school, the availability of district resources made offering professional development activities a possibility. However, the circumstances in the two schools are quite different.

The principal in the high school was given a large discretionary grant to be used during the 1989-90 school year to assist the school in making the transition from a three-year to a four-year high school. During the transition period, the principal used the theme from the former 2020 goal of reducing the dropout rate among at-risk students to provide inservice training to staff. The goal was even more relevant during this time, because of the concern that adding more students could result in the possibility of losing more at-risk students. The principal was thus able to keep fragments of the project alive via providing inservice training to teachers. The SIPD goal in the elementary school providing professional development activities dovetailed with the district's goal, hence the use of district funds to provide inservice training. Because the amount of money available was far less than what they had received through their SIPD grant, the pace of their project's implementation had slowed considerably, but not teachers' spirit. The principal and site committee made sure of this. Some faculty meetings were reserved for training provided by faculty and the district's inservice days were used for staff training, as well.

The middle school visited was unique, because while there were no professional development activities provided to staff due to of lack of funding, several teachers in the school have been using the training they received last year and have been providing training to other schools this year. To illustrate, the site committee chair commented, "I am very involved in professional development and have been invited to present a one-to-two hour awareness workshop for four other Eastern Oregon districts this year, and have already put on four full-training workshops. I have three more scheduled for this summer: small school's conference, Baker School District, and an Eastern Oregon State College Summer class." Her comment was not unusual. Several other site committee members made similar remarks during the site visit in the spring. The site committee chair also noted, however, that not having an SIPD grant had resulted in fewer

decisions being made in areas requiring money, and staff development decisions require money. The remaining elementary school visited has no project in place, and, consequently, no professional development activities. They not only lost their funding, but they also lost their principal, who was a key actor in the school's 2020 activities.

School Level

Regardless of year of project, professional development activities available to teachers in middle school/junior high school and secondary schools were similar in type (e.g., workshops, conferences, courses) to those offered in elementary schools, but because of school organization size and complexity, the way in which professional development activities were made available to middle/junior high school and secondary school faculties was different. If offered to the entire faculty, training had to be broadly based and thus more generic in nature, or teachers were grouped and received training by specialty area, or teachers selected what they wished to attend and did so as individuals, or teachers selected what they wished to attend and did so as individuals or in small groups. The outcome generally was not the same as for elementary schools in terms of professional development having a schoolwide effect; however, middle school/junior high school and secondary school faculty voiced the same reaction as elementary faculty members to professional development activities they had participated in; each interviewee was ebullient about the new skills and knowledge she/he had acquired.

More often than not, middle school/junior high school and secondary school interviewees spoke of the individual professional benefits they had derived from participating in professional development activities. The nature of their professional training as subject matter specialists centers their attention more on their department and what they teach than on schoolwide issues. Hence, it was not uncommon to talk with excited intermediate and secondary teachers about conferences they had attended in their disciplines and workshops in their disciplines in which they had participated. When groups of teachers were able to attend a regional or national meeting of their disciplines in which they had participated (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics), they would come back to their school with a sense of renewal and enthusiasm for teaching. The fact that several teachers in a department were able to attend the same conference enabled teachers to collaborate on curriculum issues and the like.

Conversely, when schoolwide training in a particular area was provided, its utility was limited, because teachers said they did not often see its immediate application to the subject matter they taught or to their classrooms of students. This suggests that the use of schoolwide professional development activities to reach project goals in middle schools/junior high schools and secondary schools needs to begin small, i.e., within departments or grade level clusters, and gradually move outward to include a larger assemblage of individuals. When working with a diverse population, efforts to inculcate a new set of beliefs, values, and norms must be seen as viable by the individuals in each occupational community before an attempt can be made to make systemwide changes. Simply put, the variability that characterizes the organization and operation of middle schools/junior high schools and secondary schools needs to be honored and respected when staff development activities are being planned. Systemwide change is likely to occur if it is preceded by sub-system change. According to teachers, a key to facilitating this is through the availability of professional development activities that have a ready application to the subject matter being taught. Hence, if a schoolwide goal is to establish a cooperative learning

environment, training in cooperative learning that is subject-matter based is likely to be more effective in middle/junior high schools and secondary schools than schoolwide inservice training in this area. Learning the new language of cooperative learning in one's native tongue has direct utility whereas learning a generic language apparently does not.

In conclusion, the availability of professional development activities at all levels at a time when most districts have had to curtail staff development efforts was reported by interviewees to have been the most significant feature of their HB 2020 project. The opportunity to participate in a variety of workshops and conferences and to acquire new knowledge and information about teaching and learning enhanced teachers sense of themselves as professional educators. Although opportunity was predicated on the availability of resources, it was the decisions teachers made about professional development activities that made the opportunities so worthwhile. This point is significant, because it captures the essence of site-based management. Resources created opportunities that enabled teachers to make decisions about their professional lives.

Mini-grants

In addition to activities that were part of each school's general professional development program, SIPD schools could, if they elected to do so, design and administer a mini-grant program for eligible faculty members. The mini-grant program afforded individuals in a school an opportunity to pursue an independent activity or project in which they were interested, but had not previously had the resources to engage in or accomplish. Responsibility for the development and management of a school's mini-grant program rested with school site committees. This included establishing criteria for applying for grants, publicizing or advertising the availability of grants, selecting grantees, monitoring grant projects, and overseeing the fiscal management of the mini-grant program.

Individuals interested in applying for mini-grants were responsible for developing a proposal that discussed what project or activity they wished to pursue and its relationship to the schools SIPD project, what goals they were trying to reach and the means for assessing their attainment, and how they intended to use the resources (e.g., for curriculum development, to attend conferences, etc.). The mini-grant program was available to all faculty members, and in most schools there was no limit on the number of grants one could apply for. However, in schools with new and continuation projects that had elected to extend their grant over a two-year period, the total amount of money allocated for mini-grants for each school year was restricted. Grants generally were in the range of $500-$1,000. At some schools, workshops were conducted to help individuals prepare proposals. While there were certain legislative requirements for awarding grants that were the same for all SIPD schools, e.g., demonstrating the relationship between mini-grants and a school's SIPD project goals, schools, specifically site committees, had latitude in tailoring grant requirements to further the professional development of all school personnel. This generally was accomplished through a provision in a school's grant application that stipulated that grantees were required to write a short paper about their activity or project to be disseminated to all faculty members or to present at a faculty or special interest group meeting their project results or what knowledge or new information they had acquired as a result of pursuing an activity.

The majority of mini-grants were awarded to individuals interested in acquiring new teaching strategies and knowledge through participation in workshops and conferences. For example, a mathematics teacher at a large high school with a continuation project talked about being able to attend a week long seminar at Ohio State University on Modern Technology in Mathematics. He had received a grant from Oregon State University to defray the cost of the seminar and was able to use 2020 mini-grant resources to pay for travel expenses. He now is using the information in his classes and is training other teachers in his department in the teaching strategies he learned. He also hopes to begin training other mathematics teachers in his region and will use the local chapter of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics as a resource in planning workshops. When interviewees were asked about goals they hoped to reach through their mini-grant, respondents at all levels cited personal professional goals related to teaching and learning, specifically, to increase their knowledge and expertise about teaching and learning and to be able to exchange and share ideas with other professionals. For many respondents, there seemed to be a blurred distinction between grant goals and personal professional needs. Having the opportunity to select and attend conferences and workshops and to pursue projects of their own choosing were identified as the most satisfying aspects of receiving a mini-grant. In terms of assessing whether their goals were being reached, most interviewees returned to their discussion of the activities they were involved in and talked about the new ways they organized their classrooms for instruction, how they employed new methods or working with certain kinds of students, how they had developed new curriculum materials, and the like. Many did not equate these outcomes with goal attainment; rather, they referred to them as the way they utilized the information gained from their grant experience. For interviewees, being able to assess goal attainment was not as important as being able to demonstrate--during the interview--how they used what they had learned and the difference it made in what they were able to do in their classrooms. The fact that their classroom climate had improved, or student learning had increased, or their teaching repertoire had been expanded was what mattered to grantees.

There are many similarities between the kinds of activities associated with mini-grants and those associated with a school's general professional development program. In many respects mini-grants were a microcosm of a school's general professional development program. For example, workshops and conferences, in particular, were selected most often by faculty members for both kinds of professional development activities. This occurred because staff development opportunities had been curtailed in most districts and teachers were hungry for new information about teaching and learning, and because workshops and conferences in their field(s) of interest are often the most appropriate venue for this to occur. These kinds of activities also offer an opportunity for professionals to exchange and share ideas with other professionals. The major difference that distinguishes mini-grants from a school's general professional development program is that with mini-grants individuals could design a project tailored to their specific needs and interests. Although the mini-grant project had to relate to the school's SIPD project goals, it afforded individuals an opportunity to pursue a special interest.

For faculty members, having the additional resources to pursue a special interest made the mini-grant worth coveting. The fact that interviewees spoke of their "mini-grant experience" in much the same vein as interviewees had discussed their school's professional development activities speaks to the wishes of individual school personnel (as opposed to district administrators) being reflected in the school's professional development program. According to all interviewees, having a voice in determining how resources were to be allocated in an area central to their professional lives made an enormous difference in their perceptions of who they were and what they were able to accomplish as educators.

References

Anderson, B. and Odden, A. State initiatives can foster school improvement. Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1986.

Cotton, K. Effective Schooling Practices: A Research Synthesis 1990 Update, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, April, 1990.

Goodlad, J.I. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, McGraw Hill, 1984.

Kyle, M.J. (Ed.) Reaching for Excellence: An Effective Schools Sourcebook, Washington: National Institute of Education, 1985.

Paule, L., Faddis, B., and Savard, W. Oregon School Improvement and Professional Development Project Final Report, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, October, 1989.

Purkey, S.C. and Smith, M.S. Effective Schools: A Review. Elementary School Journal, vol. 83 (March 1983).

The finding that interviewees were familiar with the kind of data being collected at their school during the course of the year was especially true at the elementary and middle/junior high school levels in schools with an overarching school improvement program that was academically focused. Here goals were clearly tied to a program, and faculty members saw their role and responsibility in achieving the goals in the project and in gathering information to be used to assess progress being made to reach the goals. For interviewees in these sites, the data collected usually had a relationship to assessing whether goals had been reached. Where confusion arose, it had to do with interviewees being uncertain about how some kinds of data, e.g., surveys, could be used to measure goal attainment. The link was too nebulous. In these cases specifically and in all cases generally, the extent to which an evaluation consultant or specific individuals on a site committee had responsibility for overseeing the evaluation of the project made a difference in interviewees' level of understanding. These individuals educated the faculty about assessment and evaluation activities and their relationship to measuring goal attainment.

In addition to this difference from year one, there was an increase in the level of sophistication among interviewees as to how data were actually being used. It is one thing to be knowledgeable about assessment activities; it is another to understand how the data are used and then to actually use the information to make changes in a project. Individuals at all levels talked about the utility of the information being gathered from a number of sources. In one elementary school kindergarten teachers described their "self-esteem curriculum" and how the information they gathered from observing students reactions to and interactions with one another was used to guide their discussions during parent conferences. The principal in this school also commented on the effects of the program in terms of the decrease in the number of discipline referrals. He had documented the number of discipline referrals on a month-by-month basis prior and subsequent to the implementation of the curriculum and had noticed a sharp decline in referral

discussion, varies by district and school and is often the result of pressures to address educational symptoms (e.g., drugs, violence, absenteeism) of problems in the larger environment in which schools operate (e.g., economic hardship, broken families). Hence, the amount of school-level decision-making involvement and influence available to teachers can be constrained by conditions outside the control of school faculty.

Notwithstanding the powerful influence of the institutional environment, a major thrust of the movement toward greater teacher professionalism in the workplace (i.e., site-based management) has been to empower teachers by granting them greater control over their own jobs, as well as collective say in shaping the policies and practices of their schools. Indeed, one of them major thrusts of HB 2020 was to have faculty actively share in the educational planning and decision making of the school. However, for this goal to be achieved required the reallocation of power from districts to schools and from administrators to teachers. Achievement of this kind breeds expectation. Hence, in 2020 schools the expected effect of this movement toward site-based management was a change in the locus of control over key decision domains that affect the work lives of teachers. This was to translate into influence over decisions that extended beyond the classroom door. Has this occurred?

Interviewees in all schools visited were provided with definitions of decision-making involvement and influence (see definitions at beginning of this section) and were asked: 1) what decision areas teachers were most and least influential and involved in, 2) whether the areas teachers were most influential and involved in had increased since the beginning of their SIPD project and if so, in what areas, 3) whether they wished they had more influence in school matters and if so, in what areas, and 4) what constraints precluded their having greater influence. Responses were tabulated and grouped into the four decision domains identified in last year's SIPD evaluation: 1) personnel decisions (e.g., staffing, determining own teaching assignment), 2) school budget and policy decisions (e.g., policies in attendance, discipline, assessment, grading, resource allocation), 3) curriculum and instruction decisions (e.g., selecting textbooks, determining curriculum, selecting teaching strategies), and 4) staff development/school improvement decisions (e.g., selecting professional development activities, developing school improvement program). An additional decision domain called "2020 Project activities" surfaced this year and is being kept separate from the other decision domains, because respondents in several schools referred specifically to their projects to illustrate the decision areas where they have become most influential and involved since being awarded their SIPD grant.

Table 4 presents the responses of interviewees by type of project and school level.

Table 4

Teacher Influence and Involvement in Decision Making

	Decision Area(s) With Most Infl. & Inv.	Decision Area(s) With Least Influ. & Inv.	Decision Area(s), With Most Infl. & Inv. Since HB 2020	Decision Area(s) Wish More Influ. & Inv.
CONTINUATION PROJECTS				
Elementary	Curriculum & Instruction 2020 Project Activities	School Budget & Policy	2020 Project Activities	School Budget & Policy
Middle/ Junior H.S.	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	Staff Development/ School Improvement	School Budget & Policy
High School	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy Personnel	School Budget & Policy	School Budget, & Policy, Personnel
NEW PROJECTS				
Elementary	Curriculum & Instruction	Curriculum & Instruction Personnel, Budget & Policy	Curriculum & Instruction	None Identified
Middle/ Junior H.S.	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	Staff Development/ School Improvement, School Budget & Policy	School Budget & Policy
High School	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	Staff Development/ School Improvement	School Budget & Policy Curriculum & Instruction
NONFUNDED PROJECTS				
Elementary	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy Curriculum & Instruction	2020 Project Activities	School Budget & Policy Curriculum & Instruction
Middle/ Junior H.S.	School Budget & Policy Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy
High School	Curriculum & Instruction	School Budget & Policy	2020 Project Activities	School Budget & Policy

Of the five decision domains, decisions around curriculum and instruction activities are the areas in which the majority of teachers in all types of projects and across all grade levels feel they are most influential and involved. This is not surprising given that many of these kinds of decisions are classroom-related decisions and are central to the work lives of teachers.

The decision domain where teachers feel least influential and involved and, not surprisingly, where they wish to have more influence and involvement is in the areas of school budget and policy making. Although teachers in high schools with continuation projects and middle/junior high schools with new projects indicated that they have gained influence and greater involvement over these areas since the beginning of their SIPD project, it is still difficult for most teachers to make progress in this area. The constraints of school and district administration surfaced most often in discussions with teachers about areas where they feel the least influential and involved. This is not surprising given the congeries of influence in a school's regulatory environment that pose constraints and contingencies on how schools are to operate. Influence from the school's regulatory environment and central office preclude teachers from being more influential in the workplace, hence teacher's perceptions that they do not have much involvement and influence in many school-related decisions.

Of particular interest are the decision areas identified by interviewees where there has been the most progress since the inception of their SIPD project. Interviewees indicated that they have been most influential and involved in decisions concerning all aspects of their 2020 projects, those relating specifically to staff development, and to those pertaining to curriculum and instruction activities. Given the focus of HB 2020, this finding about 2020 project activities is to be expected. However, the fact that interviewees in middle/junior high schools with new projects and in high schools with continuation projects identified decision domains beyond the specific parameters of their 2020 projects is especially noteworthy, because it says that teacher empowerment in the workplace is expanding to include other areas critical to the teachers' work lives. The increase in decision opportunities noted in an earlier discussion has resulted in an increase in teachers' decision-making influence and involvement. Teachers are experiencing greater control over decision areas, particularly those pertaining to budget and policy, that impact what they do in schools. However, as clearly shown in Table 4, what they have gained is still not enough. The wish for greater influence over policies that affect their work lives was expressed in the majority of interviews with teachers in all types of projects. The litany of constraints identified by interviewees earlier was also voiced by interviewees during these discussions. Unfortunately, many schools are located in environments that may preclude teachers from gaining more control over policies that impact the operation of their school. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight the progress that has been attained by schools with projects.

These findings are important because the nature and extent of control teachers feel they have over their world of work, vis-a-vis what they would like to have, is at the heart of implementing a successful school-based management program. For a school-based management program to have more than symbolic meaning for teachers requires that teachers gain a greater share of authority to make decisions regarding their work and feel that their desired level of decision involvement and/or influence in matters that are important for them is not discrepant from what they feel they actually have.

Professional Growth and Development

Overview

A major intent of HB 2020 is to make professional development opportunities related to a school's SIPD project available to all faculty. Professional development activities became a major part of each project's initial conceptualization and were viewed as a critical component to the achievement of a school's SIPD goals. For schools with new projects, professional development activities generally played a prominent role in the developmental stages of the school's project; in schools with continuation projects where attention was focused on the implementation of the project, professional development activities played a more secondary role, especially in schools that had elected to extend their project over a two-year period. In schools with nonfunded projects, the opportunity to participate in professional development activities was contingent on the availability of resources. Professional development activities in all types of projects consisted of individual activities, group activities, and mini-grant activities. These categories were not entirely separate and often were mutually supportive. Types of professional development activities included workshops, university and college courses, seminars, research projects, visitations to other schools and programs, conferences, teacher presentations, and staff retreats. Depending on the nature of a school's project, professional development activities were provided to individuals and/or an entire school. Faculty members in the 24 schools visited were queried about the nature and extent of professional development activities in their schools. In particular, they were asked about teacher influence and involvement in decisions about professional development activities and the effects of professional development activities on their own professional growth and on the realization of their school's SIPD project goals.

Teacher Influence and Involvement in Decisions About Professional Development Activities

One of the most consistent findings across all types of projects was that professional growth and career opportunities were an integral part of every SIPD project and control over these kinds of decisions rested with site committees and often the entire faculty at a school.

During interviews, faculty members were asked about changes in decision-making opportunities since the implementation of HB 2020, and nearly all individuals concurred that opportunities had increased, particularly in areas related to their SIPD project. Specifically, interviewees identified professional development activities as the area where they had the greatest amount of decision influence. Given that the majority of SIPD resources were allocated to this area, it is not surprising that teachers felt they had influence in deciding how money was to be spent on staff development.

For teachers, professional development activities are their life-blood; the activities are capable of recharging when motivation plummets, and they often provide the inspiration to persevere in the face of adversity. Hence, their importance for teachers as a decision domain cannot be understated. Interviewees overwhelmingly cited the ability to make decisions in this area as central to their identities as professionals. This expression of satisfaction was related, in their minds, with the amount of control they felt they now had in determining how professional development resources were to be allocated. Teachers, in particular, noted that being able to

decide how to enhance their roles as an educator was an important source of power and control over their work. For most interviewees, prior to HB 2020, authority over this important decision domain had been out of their hands. Not surprisingly, change in this area has had significant consequences for teachers; however, as a matter of importance, the change is related directly to the larger issue of school finance.

The economic environment in which a great many of the SIPD schools operate has been, according to interviewees, stable but poor. Many of the schools visited are in the safety net. Financial instability has translated into a retrenching of funding in certain educational areas. Most notable for teachers among the areas cut has been staff development. Over time, as staff development funds have been curtailed and earmarked for other educational areas, districts have responded to staff development needs by providing only districtwide activities. This common denominator approach has resulted in teachers feeling that their professional growth needs are not being satisfied. For many, the inservice activities made available by the district simply did not make a difference to them professionally; that is, either they were not tailored to the specific needs of the audience (an impossible task when the audience is all the teachers in a district) or they did not enhance teachers professional development as educators (also an impossible task when an audience is so diverse in background). Consequently, according to interviewees, teachers often passively resisted their district's attempts to provide meaningful staff development activities by attending but not actively participating. This practice changed with the implementation of HB 2020.

According to interviewees, for the first time in most of their professional lives they had control over decisions about how best to enhance their role as educators. Without question, the ability to decide how to allocate resources--lots of resources--to this area changed the lives of teachers more than any other aspect of the legislation. Teachers became effusive when they described the activities they had chosen for their school and for themselves. For the majority of SIPD schools, professional development training in particular areas was the vehicle for reaching specific project goals. For example, in several schools project activities were focused on increasing students' self-esteem, in particular, those students who were considered at-risk of leaving school. This was achieved initially by providing teachers with inservice training in becoming sensitized to the needs of this population and in different teaching and behavioral approaches to use with at-risk students to increase their success in school. During the second year, some sites were implementing schoolwide programs developed specifically for this student population. The fact that faculty members decided both on the actual goal and how to reach the goal through specific project activities made teachers feel that they were in charge of their professional lives. And in schools that opted to include mini-grants as part of their SIPD project, teachers were able to select activities that were unique to their grant's goals. The amount of latitude teachers had in selecting professional development activities was infinite in the sense that control over the decisions rested with them. The only requirement was that professional development activities had to relate to the school's SIPD project. Because project goals had been decided on by the faculty through a comprehensive needs assessment, this restriction did not pose any problem for the majority of individuals interviewed. Indeed, according to many interviewees, this practice--identifying needs through an assessment, relating activities to project goals, and providing a variety of activities to meet or satisfy the goals--is different from the way their districts have operated in the past with respect to determining and providing staff development opportunities.

Effects of Professional Development Activities

The impact of resource allocation on professional development opportunities has been felt by almost everyone in each of the schools visited. Interviewees in all the schools visited were able to carry on conversations about their schools professional development activities and the benefits they had derived from participating in workshops and attending conferences, suggesting that this particular feature of the legislation had reached nearly everyone in each of the schools. According to teachers at all levels, the professional development activities that provided new information and knowledge about teaching strategies, a new language for teachers to communicate with one another, and that encouraged teacher interaction and dialogue about the newly acquired learning were the most helpful and the most utilized. The ability of the trainer to concretize concepts (e.g., how to use cooperative learning in American Literature classes) also enabled teachers to immediately apply what they had learned. This was particularly true for high school teachers. Hence, regardless of a school's specific project goals, professional development activities that could be readily transported into the classroom were, according to interviewees at all levels, the most appreciated. Teachers in SIPD schools where attaining project goals required learning a new language were also in the propitious position to then be able to communicate across grade levels or subject areas. For example, an elementary school with a nonfunded project had as one of its goals during year one "writing across the curriculum" and had hired two consultants to provide training in this area. During interviews with faculty members at this school last year, individuals emphasized how primary teachers were now able to talk with intermediate teachers about designing a writing curriculum that included a progression of skills to be taught at each grade in different subject areas and how to assess students writing ability on an ongoing basis. A first grade teacher referred to a discussion she had had with a fifth grade teacher about implementing a writing project and noted that this kind of conversation would not and could not have been possible without the training the faculty had received. This year the school's 2020 goal dovetailed with a district goal to train teachers in how to teach thinking and writing. Teachers' ability to acquire new knowledge and learn new instructional strategies was enhanced because they spoke a common language and had worked together on the project last year. According to a site committee member, although the lack of funding has resulted in the faculty going at a slower pace, the skills teachers had learned last year have enabled them "to discuss within and across grade levels how writing traits will be taught and how to connect thinking and writing in the assessment process." In this school, district staff development funds are being used to train teachers in the district. "Whole faculty professional development training" in an area was more common in elementary schools and often resulted in elementary teachers speaking the same language. This enhanced their opportunity to work together on a wide variety of school issues, not just those related to specific project goals.

The example of the nonfunded site is an illustration of how staff development activities can enhance not only one's professional growth, but the implementation of a project as well. How a school conceptualizes and utilizes staff development training during its first year has bearing on the ease with which a project is implemented its second year. The extent to which a school has an overarching and coherent school improvement program facilitates this process. Individual professional development activities can improve one's skills in the classroom and increase one's confidence about trying new instructional approaches with students, according to interviewees at all grade levels in all types of projects. And, often, if enough people receive the same training, the benefits extend beyond a single classroom or a department. However, professional development training that involves everyone and that is integrally related to a school's school

improvement program has the greatest impact schoolwide, especially professional development training that is tied to goals that promote academic excellence. In schools where this has occurred it is possible to see the effects of this important part of HB 2020 on a school. Here, the total effect on a school is greater than the sum of its parts.

As a final note, an unanticipated effect of professional development activities on teachers in several SIPD schools has been the expertise and skills they have acquired as trainers. Many teachers have utilized the training they have received in certain areas to train teachers in their own school and in the case of the nonfunded junior high school, teachers have been involved in training teachers in other schools. In the truest sense of the word, then, there has been professional development. As teachers became proficient with specialized instruction and practice they took their newly acquired knowledge and expertise and did what they do best: taught others what they had learned. The intrinsic reward from these experiences has enhanced teachers' self-esteem and at the nonfunded junior high school has had the added benefit of motivating site committee members to keep their project alive. What is most important here, from the standpoint of empowerment, is that veteran teachers have taken on a portion of one of the most vital functions in a school: the continuing professional education of fellow teachers. And they didn't have to give up teaching and become administrators to do it.

Differences in Professional Development By Type of Project and School Level

Type of Project

Stage of project development and resource allocation played a critical role in the nature and extent of professional development activities being provided in each of the 24 schools visited. Generally, the newer the project and the shorter the time frame for the project, the greater the number of professional development activities offered in a school. This was true for schools at all levels.

Schools with new projects that had decided to work on their project during one school year used most of their resources for staff development activities. According to interviewees, faculty were engaged and involved in myriad activities related to the attainment of their project goals. For many schools, the infusion of so much money into this area resulted in teachers being able to attend as many conferences, workshops, and the like as they wished and for which there was time. In addition to school-level professional development activities, mini-grants were also available in some of these schools. For new (and continuation) projects where the school had elected to extend the project over a two-year period, the whirl of professional development activity present in schools conducting project activities in one year looked, by comparison, like people moving in a film being shown in slow motion. Because funding was spread over a two-year period, resources allocated for professional development activities were literally cut-in-half. The number of activities available was reduced and the criteria for granting resources to individuals was more restrictive. Having less money required site committees to be more prudent in the selection criteria they developed for making decisions.

Schools with continuation projects operated very differently with respect to professional development activities offered this year than they had during year one, and this rankled interviewees in many of the schools visited. The abundance (in number and in kind) of

professional development activities available to faculty last year was not available this year for two reasons. First, schools that elected to extend their project over a two-year period were faced with reducing their grant by half, which resulted in fewer total dollars being available in each of the two years. Second, year two was, as discussed in prior sections, the implementation year, and the nature of the activities offered was related directly to this end. The combination of these translated into fewer and more restricted choices. Feeling flush had given way to feeling penurious, a state several interviewees equated with "how things were prior to HB 2020." Although this was not the case, it speaks to what can happen when a school that was poor receives a lot of money and most of it is directed toward increasing the professional development of teachers. In many of the schools visited teachers have felt starved for professional development opportunities and their SIPD grant kept them sated for a school year. This year has been different, and in many respects, what is happening this year is more realistic in terms of teachers' time and relating professional development activities directly to implementing a project. Where there has been latitude, it has been in the area of mini-grants. In schools with mini-grants, teachers still have opportunity to pursue a special interest. As a final note, several schools with continuation projects are using faculty members to provide inservice training to staff. This type of staff development effort is different from how most schools received training during year one.

The schools with nonfunded projects had varying degrees of professional development activities, ranging from none being available in two of the schools (one elementary and the middle school) to some being offered in two of the schools (one elementary and the high school). In both the elementary school and high school, the availability of district resources made offering professional development activities a possibility. However, the circumstances in the two schools are quite different.

The principal in the high school was given a large discretionary grant to be used during the 1989-90 school year to assist the school in making the transition from a three-year to a four-year high school. During the transition period, the principal used the theme from the former 2020 goal of reducing the dropout rate among at-risk students to provide inservice training to staff. The goal was even more relevant during this time, because of the concern that adding more students could result in the possibility of losing more at-risk students. The principal was thus able to keep fragments of the project alive via providing inservice training to teachers. The SIPD goal in the elementary school providing professional development activities dovetailed with the district's goal, hence the use of district funds to provide inservice training. Because the amount of money available was far less than what they had received through their SIPD grant, the pace of their project's implementation had slowed considerably, but not teachers' spirit. The principal and site committee made sure of this. Some faculty meetings were reserved for training provided by faculty and the district's inservice days were used for staff training, as well.

The middle school visited was unique, because while there were no professional development activities provided to staff due to of lack of funding, several teachers in the school have been using the training they received last year and have been providing training to other schools this year. To illustrate, the site committee chair commented, "I am very involved in professional development and have been invited to present a one-to-two hour awareness workshop for four other Eastern Oregon districts this year, and have already put on four full-training workshops. I have three more scheduled for this summer: small school's conference, Baker School District, and an Eastern Oregon State College Summer class." Her comment was not unusual. Several other site committee members made similar remarks during the site visit in the spring. The site committee chair also noted, however, that not having an SIPD grant had resulted in fewer

decisions being made in areas requiring money, and staff development decisions require money. The remaining elementary school visited has no project in place, and, consequently, no professional development activities. They not only lost their funding, but they also lost their principal, who was a key actor in the school's 2020 activities.

School Level

Regardless of year of project, professional development activities available to teachers in middle school/junior high school and secondary schools were similar in type (e.g., workshops, conferences, courses) to those offered in elementary schools, but because of school organization size and complexity, the way in which professional development activities were made available to middle/junior high school and secondary school faculties was different. If offered to the entire faculty, training had to be broadly based and thus more generic in nature, or teachers were grouped and received training by specialty area, or teachers selected what they wished to attend and did so as individuals, or teachers selected what they wished to attend and did so as individuals or in small groups. The outcome generally was not the same as for elementary schools in terms of professional development having a schoolwide effect; however, middle school/junior high school and secondary school faculty voiced the same reaction as elementary faculty members to professional development activities they had participated in; each interviewee was ebullient about the new skills and knowledge she/he had acquired.

More often than not, middle school/junior high school and secondary school interviewees spoke of the individual professional benefits they had derived from participating in professional development activities. The nature of their professional training as subject matter specialists centers their attention more on their department and what they teach than on schoolwide issues. Hence, it was not uncommon to talk with excited intermediate and secondary teachers about conferences they had attended in their disciplines and workshops in their disciplines in which they had participated. When groups of teachers were able to attend a regional or national meeting of their disciplines in which they had participated (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics), they would come back to their school with a sense of renewal and enthusiasm for teaching. The fact that several teachers in a department were able to attend the same conference enabled teachers to collaborate on curriculum issues and the like.

Conversely, when schoolwide training in a particular area was provided, its utility was limited, because teachers said they did not often see its immediate application to the subject matter they taught or to their classrooms of students. This suggests that the use of schoolwide professional development activities to reach project goals in middle schools/junior high schools and secondary schools needs to begin small, i.e., within departments or grade level clusters, and gradually move outward to include a larger assemblage of individuals. When working with a diverse population, efforts to inculcate a new set of beliefs, values, and norms must be seen as viable by the individuals in each occupational community before an attempt can be made to make systemwide changes. Simply put, the variability that characterizes the organization and operation of middle schools/junior high schools and secondary schools needs to be honored and respected when staff development activities are being planned. Systemwide change is likely to occur if it is preceded by sub-system change. According to teachers, a key to facilitating this is through the availability of professional development activities that have a ready application to the subject matter being taught. Hence, if a schoolwide goal is to establish a cooperative learning

environment, training in cooperative learning that is subject-matter based is likely to be more effective in middle/junior high schools and secondary schools than schoolwide inservice training in this area. Learning the new language of cooperative learning in one's native tongue has direct utility whereas learning a generic language apparently does not.

In conclusion, the availability of professional development activities at all levels at a time when most districts have had to curtail staff development efforts was reported by interviewees to have been the most significant feature of their HB 2020 project. The opportunity to participate in a variety of workshops and conferences and to acquire new knowledge and information about teaching and learning enhanced teachers sense of themselves as professional educators. Although opportunity was predicated on the availability of resources, it was the decisions teachers made about professional development activities that made the opportunities so worthwhile. This point is significant, because it captures the essence of site-based management. Resources created opportunities that enabled teachers to make decisions about their professional lives.

Mini-grants

In addition to activities that were part of each school's general professional development program, SIPD schools could, if they elected to do so, design and administer a mini-grant program for eligible faculty members. The mini-grant program afforded individuals in a school an opportunity to pursue an independent activity or project in which they were interested, but had not previously had the resources to engage in or accomplish. Responsibility for the development and management of a school's mini-grant program rested with school site committees. This included establishing criteria for applying for grants, publicizing or advertising the availability of grants, selecting grantees, monitoring grant projects, and overseeing the fiscal management of the mini-grant program.

Individuals interested in applying for mini-grants were responsible for developing a proposal that discussed what project or activity they wished to pursue and its relationship to the schools SIPD project, what goals they were trying to reach and the means for assessing their attainment, and how they intended to use the resources (e.g., for curriculum development, to attend conferences, etc.). The mini-grant program was available to all faculty members, and in most schools there was no limit on the number of grants one could apply for. However, in schools with new and continuation projects that had elected to extend their grant over a two-year period, the total amount of money allocated for mini-grants for each school year was restricted. Grants generally were in the range of $500-$1,000. At some schools, workshops were conducted to help individuals prepare proposals. While there were certain legislative requirements for awarding grants that were the same for all SIPD schools, e.g., demonstrating the relationship between mini-grants and a school's SIPD project goals, schools, specifically site committees, had latitude in tailoring grant requirements to further the professional development of all school personnel. This generally was accomplished through a provision in a school's grant application that stipulated that grantees were required to write a short paper about their activity or project to be disseminated to all faculty members or to present at a faculty or special interest group meeting their project results or what knowledge or new information they had acquired as a result of pursuing an activity.

The majority of mini-grants were awarded to individuals interested in acquiring new teaching strategies and knowledge through participation in workshops and conferences. For example, a mathematics teacher at a large high school with a continuation project talked about being able to attend a week long seminar at Ohio State University on Modern Technology in Mathematics. He had received a grant from Oregon State University to defray the cost of the seminar and was able to use 2020 mini-grant resources to pay for travel expenses. He now is using the information in his classes and is training other teachers in his department in the teaching strategies he learned. He also hopes to begin training other mathematics teachers in his region and will use the local chapter of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics as a resource in planning workshops. When interviewees were asked about goals they hoped to reach through their mini-grant, respondents at all levels cited personal professional goals related to teaching and learning, specifically, to increase their knowledge and expertise about teaching and learning and to be able to exchange and share ideas with other professionals. For many respondents, there seemed to be a blurred distinction between grant goals and personal professional needs. Having the opportunity to select and attend conferences and workshops and to pursue projects of their own choosing were identified as the most satisfying aspects of receiving a mini-grant. In terms of assessing whether their goals were being reached, most interviewees returned to their discussion of the activities they were involved in and talked about the new ways they organized their classrooms for instruction, how they employed new methods or working with certain kinds of students, how they had developed new curriculum materials, and the like. Many did not equate these outcomes with goal attainment; rather, they referred to them as the way they utilized the information gained from their grant experience. For interviewees, being able to assess goal attainment was not as important as being able to demonstrate--during the interview--how they used what they had learned and the difference it made in what they were able to do in their classrooms. The fact that their classroom climate had improved, or student learning had increased, or their teaching repertoire had been expanded was what mattered to grantees.

There are many similarities between the kinds of activities associated with mini-grants and those associated with a school's general professional development program. In many respects mini-grants were a microcosm of a school's general professional development program. For example, workshops and conferences, in particular, were selected most often by faculty members for both kinds of professional development activities. This occurred because staff development opportunities had been curtailed in most districts and teachers were hungry for new information about teaching and learning, and because workshops and conferences in their field(s) of interest are often the most appropriate venue for this to occur. These kinds of activities also offer an opportunity for professionals to exchange and share ideas with other professionals. The major difference that distinguishes mini-grants from a school's general professional development program is that with mini-grants individuals could design a project tailored to their specific needs and interests. Although the mini-grant project had to relate to the school's SIPD project goals, it afforded individuals an opportunity to pursue a special interest.

For faculty members, having the additional resources to pursue a special interest made the mini-grant worth coveting. The fact that interviewees spoke of their "mini-grant experience" in much the same vein as interviewees had discussed their school's professional development activities speaks to the wishes of individual school personnel (as opposed to district administrators) being reflected in the school's professional development program. According to all interviewees, having a voice in determining how resources were to be allocated in an area central to their professional lives made an enormous difference in their perceptions of who they were and what they were able to accomplish as educators.

References

Anderson, B. and Odden, A. State initiatives can foster school improvement. Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1986.

Cotton, K. Effective Schooling Practices: A Research Synthesis 1990 Update, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, April, 1990.

Goodlad, J.I. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, McGraw Hill, 1984.

Kyle, M.J. (Ed.) Reaching for Excellence: An Effective Schools Sourcebook, Washington: National Institute of Education, 1985.

Paule, L., Faddis, B., and Savard, W. Oregon School Improvement and Professional Development Project Final Report, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, October, 1989.

Purkey, S.C. and Smith, M.S. Effective Schools: A Review. Elementary School Journal, vol. 83 March 1983.